1 2	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION								
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) Docket No. 18 CR								
4	Plain	tiff,) Chicago, Illinois						
5	٧.) February 26, 2020) 8:33 a.m.						
6	XIANBING GAN,))						
7	Defen	dant.	'						
8	TRANS	VOLUME CRIPT OF PROCE							
9			M. DURKIN, and a Jury						
10	APPEARANCES:								
11	For the Government:	MR. SEAN J.B. MR. RICHARD M							
12		Assistant Uni	ted States Attorneys n R. Lausch, Jr.						
13		United States	*						
14		Chicago, IL 6							
15	For the Defendant:	MS. BROOKE L. STEVENS							
16		MR. AARON SCH Seiden Netzky	WARTZ Law Group LLC						
17		333 S. Wabash Avenue, Suite 2700 Chicago, IL 60604							
18	Also Present:	MR. XIANBING	GAN						
19			STEFANIE MOTON ecurity Investigations)						
20	Court Interpreters:		MURPHY (Mandarin)						
21		MS. TIAN HUAN MS. TINA DILL							
22	Court Reporter:		E, CSR, RDR, CRR						
23			rn Street, Room 1432						
24		Chicago, IL 60 312.435.6053							
25		laura_renke@i	lnd.uscourts.gov						

1	INDEX	
2	PAGE	
3	INSTRUCTIONS CONFERENCE 1387	
456	WITNESS MATTHEW DAOUD Cross by Mr. Seiden	
7	Redirect by Mr. Rothblatt	
9	GOVERNMENT RESTS 1439	
10	RULE 29(a) MOTION FOR JUDGMENT OF ACQUITTAL 1440	
11 12	WAIVER OF DEFENDANT'S RIGHT TO TESTIFY 1445	
13	DEFENSE RESTS	
14 15	JURY CHARGE (Final) 1449	
16	CLOSING ARGUMENTS	
17	Not Transcribed 1472	
18 19	JURY CHARGE (Final Resumed) 1478	
20	ALTERNATE JURORS EXCUSED 1483	
21		
22 23	NUMBER EXHIBITS ADMITTED	
24 25	No. 301 1438 No. 303 1438	

1	(In open court outside the presence of the jury; defendant
2	not present.)
3	THE CLERK: 18 CR 781, United States of America v.
4	Xianbing Gan.
5	THE COURT: All right. Good morning.
6	MR. SEIDEN: Good morning.
7	MR. FRANZBLAU: Good morning.
8	THE COURT: State your names for the record.
9	MR. FRANZBLAU: Sean Franzblau and Rich Rothblatt for
0	the United States.
1	MR. SEIDEN: Glenn I'm well trained.
2	THE COURT: All right.
3	MR. SEIDEN: Glenn Seiden, S-E-I-D-E-N, for for
4	Mr. Gan.
5	Ms. Stevens is not here yet. I assume that she is
6	having some problems with storing her child this morning. But
7	I'll carry on as far as I can, Judge, since I wasn't involved
8	last night on this.
19	THE COURT: No, I understand everyone's been working
20	very hard on this, and things crept up on us so that
21	preparing for closing arguments, preparing instructions, and
22	possibly even preparing for defendant to testify.
23	MR. SEIDEN: And I tried to I tried to slip a
24	dinner in there somewhere along the line.

THE COURT: Mr. Rothblatt, can you shut the door. I

1

2

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

THE COURT: That is in there. It is.

saw a juror walking by back there.

MR. SEIDEN: Yeah, I tried to slip a dinner in there.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, all right. I don't think you're going to be prejudiced, Mr. Seiden, because the objections by defense are clearly stated on the instructions I got.

I would ask the government to file these instructions on the docket because we're going to work off page numbers here.

> MR. FRANZBLAU: Okay.

THE COURT: And the only way for the appellate court to know what page numbers we're talking about is if these are put on the record.

MR. FRANZBLAU: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SEIDEN: Your Honor, I took a quick look at these last night, knowing that I wasn't going to be involved with preparing them. But I do recall not seeing an instruction for mere buyer or seller to a conspiracy. Yes, there's an instruction that the person is not involved in a conspiracy if they're a mere buyer or seller.

And I did not see an instruction regarding a co-conspirator not being a -- co-conspirator not being a government agent.

MR. SEIDEN: Okay. I don't remember seeing it, so that's --

THE COURT: Yeah. There's a discussion of that.

There's a proposal for it, the government objects, and we'll deal with it.

I didn't -- there's no buyer-seller instruction on this. If you're going to propose one, you know, so be it and we'll discuss it.

MR. SEIDEN: Well, I --

THE COURT: But --

MR. SEIDEN: -- I don't -- she's not here. I don't have the ability to do that now. But I'm going to do it orally. We would ask that a buyer-seller instruction from a conspiracy be submitted.

And the reason I'm asking for that, Judge, is that we are going to be alleging -- or we have -- we perceive, not alleging -- we perceive the evidence shows that Mr. Gan at best was buying or selling a service to the conspiracy. And as a result of that, I would like an instruction to indicate that his -- not only his mere presence but a mere purchase or seller to a conspiracy does not make him a co-conspirator.

I think your Honor -- I think your Honor understands the argument.

THE COURT: All right. It's Pattern Instruction 5.10(A).

1	MR. SEIDEN: Thank you, Judge.
2	THE COURT: We'll deal with it before we finish our
3	instruction conference. But so the record is clear, that's
4	the that is the instruction I think you're proposing, and
5	MR. SEIDEN: Also, your Honor, I don't know if I
6	don't know because I did not Mrs. Stevens is she's quite
7	brilliant when it comes to instructions, so usually I cede the
8	entire responsibility to her in my cases. But I know that
9	there we had intended to submit two instructions with regard
10	to entrapment as well.
11	THE COURT: You did.
12	MR. SEIDEN: Okay. Thank you.
13	THE COURT: They're in
14	MR. SEIDEN: I didn't see them, so I don't know.
15	THE COURT: Yeah. No, they're in there.
16	All right. We're going to work off of the page
17	numbers so that the appellate court, if there is a conviction,
18	has an accurate record of how this instruction proceeded.
19	MR. SEIDEN: I'm going to move this so I don't hit my
20	head.
21	THE COURT: All right. So page 1 we'll refer to
22	these by page numbers. But page 1 is agreed and will be given.
23	MR. SEIDEN: Okay.
24	THE COURT: Page 2
25	MR. SEIDEN: Could you since mine are not

Instructions Conference

1	numbered
2	THE COURT: Let's go off the record.
3	(Off-the-record discussion.)
4	THE COURT: All right. Back on the record.
5	Page 1, agreed, will be given.
6	Page 2, agreed, will be given.
7	Page 3, agreed, will be given.
8	Page 4, agreed, will be given.
9	Page 5, agreed, will be given.
10	Page 6, agreed, will be given.
11	Page 7, agreed, will be given.
12	7 will be modified to add the words "including the
13	defendant" at the top if he testifies. There's a modification
14	of the patterns for that. So we'll have to reserve on that one
15	to see if, in fact, he testifies.
16	All right. Page 8 is agreed, will be given.
17	Page 9 is agreed, will be given.
18	Page 10 will be given if he doesn't testify if he,
19	the defendant, doesn't testify. So we'll reserve on that.
20	Page 11 is agreed, will be given.
21	Page 12 is opposed. The argument by defense is that
22	Anthony Valdivia is someone who received or expects to receive
23	benefits in return for his testimony and cooperation with the
24	government. I don't believe the evidence supports that. He

was immunized. He has no deal.

You can argue certainly, Mr. Seiden, under the general credibility instruction that he has a bias and there's a reason for him to want to be cooperative. But, nonetheless, he would have exercised his Fifth Amendment privilege had he been called without immunity.

So the --

MR. SEIDEN: Well --

THE COURT: -- proposed instruction -- go ahead.

MR. SEIDEN: With regard -- the one I'm looking at, it says -- the last paragraph says, "You may" -- on 12 -- says, "You may give Wei Li and Valdivia testimony whatever weight." I still believe that that paragraph applies, irrespective of the fact that he -- he's not received direct benefit.

THE COURT: I don't understand your argument.

MR. SEIDEN: Well, he -- his weight -- the weight of his testimony should be given with great care and caution. He hasn't received a benefit, but he is under -- under a significant impairment.

THE COURT: No. The general credibility -- the general credibility instruction would cover him. You can argue he's got bias. You can argue a variety of things.

But the -- the caution and great care instruction is specifically given when someone has received a benefit in exchange for testifying at the trial, their testimony. And that's the way I read the pattern instruction and the law

1

supporting it.

2 3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

So 12 is going to be given over defense objection as proposed by the government. And defense has full opportunity

general instruction to argue that.

Page 13 is agreed and will be given.

to argue that Mr. Valdivia has a bias, and you can use the

Page 14 is agreed and will be given.

Page 15 is agreed and will be given.

Page 16 is agreed and will be given.

Page 17. Defense is opposed to it. Is this a pattern instruction?

MR. ROTHBLATT: No, Judge. But it's supported by the case law we cited in our original submission.

(Ms. Stevens enters the courtroom.)

MR. SEIDEN: While you're looking, Mrs. Stevens has just arrived. She's putting her coat away.

THE COURT: All right. Let's go off the record for a minute.

(Off-the-record discussion.)

THE COURT: Back on the record.

The only contested instruction that -- Ms. Stevens, that we talked about was whether Valdivia ought to be -- his testimony ought to be viewed with caution and great care, and I stated on the record why I believe -- he had no deal and that the regular credibility instruction is sufficient to argue he

has some form of bias.

But the caution and great care instruction is reserved for those who have a deal where they are going to get benefit from the government for their testimony, at least in writing or an oral agreement, neither of which exists for him.

All right. We're on page 17. This is they "should not speculate why any other person whose name you may hear during the trial is not currently on trial before you." The government provided case law allowing such an instruction, and I believe it's an appropriate cautionary instruction here.

Frankly, it's a defense-friendly instruction. If this were not given and there was any argument about where is Mr. Pan, I would instruct the jury Mr. Pan got indicted -- he was indicted. Is that correct?

MR. ROTHBLATT: Yes, Judge.

MR. FRANZBLAU: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: And he's a fugitive, or he hasn't been brought to justice. That doesn't help the defense, I don't think. If you wanted it, you could put it in, but I don't think that helps the defense. And --

MS. STEVENS: I think it's already in evidence, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is it in evidence?

MR. FRANZBLAU: No, not the fact that he was indicted. You allowed me to ask --

1	(Unintelligible crosstalk.)
2	THE COURT: One at a time. One at a time.
3	MS. STEVENS: It is in evidence.
4	MR. SEIDEN: It is in evidence.
5	THE COURT: That he was indicted?
6	MR. SEIDEN: Yes.
7	MS. STEVENS: Yes.
8	THE COURT: Who put it in?
9	MR. SEIDEN: I think it was either Moton or one of the
10	agents. Somebody put it in. I heard it.
11	MS. STEVENS: Yeah, I did too. And I don't I don't
12	remember who it came in with, but it is in evidence.
13	THE COURT: Well, regardless, I'm going to whether
14	it's in or not and you ought to see if you can agree on that
15	because if it's going to be argued, I don't want to have an
16	objection and I have to sort that out. I don't recall it
17	coming in, but it's possible your memory on that is better than
18	mine.
19	I'm going to give 17. Are you still objecting to
20	this?
21	MR. SEIDEN: Up to you.
22	MS. STEVENS: No, it's fine. We can withdraw our
23	objection.
24	THE COURT: All right. 17 is given without objection.

18 is given over objection.

1	I think "on or about" is the way it was charged in the
2	indictment, and that's always a when the indictment charges
3	something happened "on or about," the jury needs to know that
4	exact dates are not necessary to be proven. So it's given over
5	objection.
6	19 is given is agreed and will be given.
7	20 is agreed and will be given.
8	21 is agreed and will be given.
9	MR. SEIDEN: Excuse me one second on 21.
10	0kay. Thank you.
11	THE COURT: All right. 22 is agreed and will be
12	given. Page 23 is part of the instruction on page 22.
13	Page 24 is agreed and will be given.
14	Page 25 is agreed and will be given.
15	26 is a proposed instruction by defendants that
16	or that a government agent cannot be a co-conspirator, which
17	is a correct statement of the law. Government agrees with
18	that, right?
19	MR. FRANZBLAU: Correct.
20	THE COURT: All right. And you instead propose an

My suggestion is we combine the two, put both the first line, "government agent cannot be a co-conspirator," and then follow it with the two separate paragraphs the government proposes, all of which I think is an appropriate and correct

alternative instruction.

1	statement of the law.
2	Any opposition by the government?
3	MR. FRANZBLAU: No, your Honor.
4	THE COURT: By defense?
5	MR. SEIDEN: I'm reading it.
6	THE COURT: Okay.
7	MR. SEIDEN: Yes. The it should be "May 3rd."
8	THE COURT: Oh. You want to make it specific to
9	May 3rd?
10	MR. SEIDEN: Yes.
11	THE COURT: Any objection to that by the government?
2	MR. FRANZBLAU: No.
3	THE COURT: All right. So it will be "May 3rd, 2018."
4	And we will combine the first sentence with the two paragraphs
15	proposed by the government.
6	As modified, any objection by the government?
7	MR. FRANZBLAU: No, your Honor.
8	THE COURT: By defense?
9	MS. STEVENS: No, your Honor.
20	THE COURT: All right. That's how it will be given.
21	Page 27 is agreed and will be given.
22	Page 28 is agreed and will be given.
23	Page 29 is objected to by defense.
24	This is the definition that is provided in the in
25	the actual statute, 1956 I'm sorry. Yeah. 1956(c) uses

	this	is	word	for	word	what		the	definition	in	the	statute
--	------	----	------	-----	------	------	--	-----	------------	----	-----	---------

MS. STEVENS: It is, your Honor. But the indictment itself charges specific -- more specific knowledge. And that -- especially as regards the conspiracy.

THE COURT: All right. Which count are we talking about? Which section of Count I?

MS. STEVENS: Just a second.

So in the conspiracy count, that the transaction involved -- in -- page 2.

THE COURT: What paragraph?

MS. STEVENS: In paragraph a., that the transaction involved the buying, selling, et cetera, of the controlled substance, knowing that it was designed to conceal the proceeds of the specified unlawful activity. And then it only gets to the "some form of unlawful activity."

But we are talking about a specific -- the specified unlawful activity, the knowledge as to the specified unlawful activity.

THE COURT: What's the response of the government?

MR. FRANZBLAU: Judge, there's no support in the case law to say that if we are specific in the indictment -- which we were for purposes of giving him notice -- that that raises our burden of proof at trial. That would be like saying if I charge the defendant with a drug conspiracy and I specify heroin, suddenly now I have to prove it was heroin instead of

any controlled substance.

The law is the law. The government can't change the law by the way it words the indictment.

MS. STEVENS: Your Honor, I believe that the example given by the government is substantively different from the example that we're arguing. We're not talking about specifying a specific type of drug. We're saying that the government in this instruction is saying he only has to know it's bad money essentially, doesn't have to know that it's from drugs, which has been -- a great deal of the evidence entered by the government in this case is that there's a massive drug conspiracy.

THE COURT: Well, this portion of the conspiracy, which only spes -- sets forth several ways the conspiracy occurred -- of which the government doesn't have to prove up both of them or all of them, just has to prove one of the two. But this Section a. says --

Could someone please shut the back door. We have jurors walking by. Thanks.

(Continuing) -- charges that the defendant, with others, conspired, in essence, to conduct financial transactions affecting interstate commerce; transaction involved proceeds of specified unlawful activity; sets forth code sections relating to controlled substances; and that while knowing the transaction was designed to conceal and disguise.

And

Instructions Conference

THE COURT: While conducting financial transaction

1

Excuse me. What?

2

(Off-the-record discussion.)

3

knew the property involved in the transaction represented

5

proceeds of some form of unlawful activity.

6

the next two instructions deal with whether or not these are --

I think this is a correct statement of the law.

7 8

what is a controlled substance, what is a felony. But this is

9

a correct statement of the law. I don't think the indictment

10

changes this definition.

11

MR. SEIDEN: Your Honor?

12

THE COURT: Yeah.

13

MR. SEIDEN: The fact that it's a correct statement of

14

the law I perceive -- and I mean no disrespect -- I believe is

15

irrelevant. An individual was charged with an indictment. An

16

indictment -- purpose of an indictment or a charge is to inform

17

an individual what he is charged with and what he must defend

18

and, of course, protect him against being charged a second time

19

for the same offense.

20

This instruction generalizes the indictment. So now

21

we have a -- a defendant who is charged with a specific

22

offense, yet this instruction tells him, "Never mind the

23

specific offense. If he did anything that you think was

improper or wrong, you may find him guilty."

24

So when I say -- and I said I don't mean to be

disrespectful when I say that the fact that it's a statement --1 a correct fact -- statement of the law makes it -- is 2 3 irrelevant. It's irrelevant to this case. 4 I didn't charge this case; the government did. government could have left out the reference to drugs. 5 6 could have -- they could have made some other specific finding 7 or suggestion. But the indictment is clear. It has nothing to 8 do with any other offense. 9 And double jeopardy -- now what happens if they indict 10 him for moving --11 THE COURT: Well, I understand your argument. So are 12 you objecting to the last sentence? 13 (Counsel conferring.) 14 MR. SEIDEN: The problem -- go ahead. 15 MS. STEVENS: Both sentences essentially say the same 16 thing, that the property --MR. FRANZBLAU: I'm sorry. 17 18 (Counsel conferring.) 19 MR. SEIDEN: I think you get the --20 THE COURT: I don't. Hang on. Once -- we'll stay off 21 the record. 22 (Off-the-record discussion.) 23 Then let's go on the record. Go ahead. THE COURT:

MS. STEVENS: Just to be clear there, it's not just

one knowledge clause. Every single clause in there has a

24

"knowingly" or "knowing" language in it. He has to know what he's doing. And part and parcel of that is knowing that the transaction was designed to conceal, dot dot dot, the proceeds of the specified unlawful activity, which is drugs.

THE COURT: All right. Well, the first -Mr. Franzblau is right. There's two knowledge sections in
subsection a. of the conspiracy count: knowledge that the -that -- knowingly conducting a financial transaction involving
the -- which transaction involved the proceeds of specified
unlawful activity, namely, drug felonies; and, two, knowledge
that the transaction was designed in part to conceal the
nature, location, source, et cetera, of the proceeds of the
specified unlawful activity.

MS. STEVENS: Right.

MR. SEIDEN: Right. The antecedent is drugs.

THE COURT: Well, the first one talking about drugs -- well, I'm -- off the record.

(Off-the-record discussion.)

THE COURT: Back on the record.

So 29 is reserved.

30 is agreed and will be given.

31 is agreed and will be given.

32 I don't -- 32 and 33 are the -- two-page instruction.

I believe this was agreed to by defense in the opening

1	instructions when we added the words "as it applies to Counts I
2	through IV" at the beginning of this. That was an objection
3	you made. We modified it, and there was no objection
4	preliminarily.
5	Are you still objecting to this?
6	MS. STEVENS: Only in the sense that we believe it
7	needs to we need to also include all the Illinois law
8	instructions which are later.
9	THE COURT: Yeah. That this we're talking about
10	Counts I through IV here. We put in the language
11	MS. STEVENS: Yes. That's fine. You're absolutely
12	correct. I think we did withdraw it.
13	THE COURT: All right. So pages 32 and 33 are agreed.
14	MR. FRANZBLAU: Judge, I'm sorry. Can we go back to
15	31? I just wanted to flag this for the defense.
16	THE COURT: Yeah.
17	MR. FRANZBLAU: They had Brooke had flagged
18	MS. STEVENS: Oh, yeah. That's fine.
19	MR. FRANZBLAU: That's agreed?
20	MS. STEVENS: That's fine, yeah.
21	MR. FRANZBLAU: Never mind. We're good.
22	THE COURT: All right. 31 is agreed, and it will be
23	given.

The instruction on pages 32 and 33 are agreed and will

be given.

	The instruction on page 34 is agreed and will be
given.	
	Page 35 is agreed and will be given.

36 is agreed and will be given.

37 is going to be given over objection. I believe it's an accurate statement of the -- of the statute.

38. This is where Gan has an objection, needing clarification of the Illinois statutory definitions. I'm going to give that. I believe that -- you can't charge someone saying that they violated the licensing requirement in Illinois without defining what that licensing requirement is.

So on page 38, the defense proposal will be given, along with the government's statement, which is an accurate statement, at the beginning. But the definitions that are proposed by Gan on the rest of page 38 are going to be given.

Is that over government objection?

MR. FRANZBLAU: No.

THE COURT: All right. So that's without objection, and we'll make those modifications.

39 and 40 and into page 41 are all entrapment instructions. I'm going to give them. I believe there is a gap between the time the conspiracy where Gan was allegedly involved and the time that Lim began to cooperate. And her initiating the contact with Gan allows at least some argument -- and it's a slight burden -- to at least allow the

instruction to be given. I'm not going to substitute myself as a fact-finder. I'm going to give the entrapment instruction.

The jury can decide if there's predisposition. The government has plenty of evidence to argue that he was predisposed. They have plenty of evidence to argue that the inducement was not extraordinary. But they're entitled to argue it and let the jury decide. So the entrapment instructions are going to be given.

And I believe that is it other than the one we reserved on.

MR. SEIDEN: And I think I had talked about buy-sell.

THE COURT: All right. Talk to the government about that while I hear the motion call --

MR. SEIDEN: Very well.

THE COURT: -- and see if you reach agreement on it.

I'm not sure you will. But we'll deal with the buyer-seller instruction, and we'll deal with the one I reserved on after our break.

And then, Mr. Seiden, find out if your client is going to testify.

MR. SEIDEN: Yeah.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SEIDEN: Well, we need him.

THE COURT: I know you do. I just want to give you your list of things to do in the next 15 minutes.

	MR.	SEIDEN:	Now	you're	getting	а	taste	of	what	Ι	go
through,	Judo	ge.									

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

(The Court attends to other matters.)

5 *********************************

. _

THE COURT: Well, let's go on the record now.

The defendant has proposed a buyer-seller instruction, which is Instruction 5.10(A) in the Seventh Circuit pattern instructions. Mr. Seiden, succinctly put your reasons on the record for why you want this instruction.

MR. SEIDEN: Well, we perceive that it could be argued that the services he provided to the conspiracy is that of a vendor as opposed to a participant.

THE COURT: All right. Government's response?

MR. FRANZBLAU: Judge, the buyer-seller instruction does not apply outside of the context of drugs distribution, specifically the on-the-spot exchange or sale of drugs between a supplier and a user. It's designed entirely as your Honor stated, to protect a mere drug user from incurring conspiratorial liability simply by purchasing drugs from someone and consuming them.

THE COURT: All right. The committee comments for this instruction note that "A routine buyer-seller relationship, without more, does not equate to [a] conspiracy." And this is given routinely in a situation where a -- typically a user, someone who is not part of the overall conspiracy, just buys drugs, doesn't through that action become a member of the broader conspiracy that involves importation or larger distributions of drugs.

In this case, it's not a drug conspiracy charge.

Certainly it -- it -- there's talk of drugs. The proceeds are drugs. They have to be illegal proceeds of some kind, and in this case it is illegal proceeds relating to drug transactions.

But the conspiracy charged is not a conspiracy under 21 U.S.C. 846, a drug conspiracy. It's 18 U.S.C. 1956. It's a money laundering conspiracy.

So -- yeah, 1956(h), in fact.

So the instruction is refused.

Okay. We have one other one left. Let me give some thought to it. And then we're waiting -- off the record.

(Off-the-record discussion.)

THE COURT: You want this on the record?

MR. FRANZBLAU: Yeah. I'm sorry.

Your Honor, as to the one instruction that we've reserved and that you're going to consider further on page 29, the government proposes adding a clause at the beginning "As it applies to Counts I through IV," just as we have on page 28, because for Count V, there's no requirement that we show that the underlying money is derived from unlawful proceeds.

THE COURT: All right. Any objection to that modification?

MS. STEVENS: I mean, our objection to the instruction remains the same, but I don't care about the modification.

THE COURT: All right. We'll make the modification if this instruction's given.

1 MR. FRANZBLAU: Thank you, your Honor. 2 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 3 (Pause in proceedings.) 4 COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise. 5 (Jury in at 9:36 a.m.; defendant present.) 6 THE COURT: Please be seated, ladies and gentlemen. 7 All right. 8 MR. SEIDEN: Thank you. 9 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for --10 COURT REPORTER: The mics aren't working. 11 THE CLERK: What's going on here? 12 (Off-the-record discussion.) 13 THE COURT: Well, good morning, ladies and gentlemen. 14 Sorry for the delay. I know you got an instruction on witness 15 credibility. And if I were a witness, I wouldn't be very 16 credible because I've told you every day when we're starting, 17 and I've been wrong each day. 18 But we were able to get some work done in your absence 19 relating to the case. And I expect that you'll be hearing 20 closing arguments this morning, sometime this morning. 21 The schedule is after the closing argument by the 22 government, our court security officer is going to take you 23 down to the second floor for lunch. We want to keep you 24 together. So you're -- you don't have to eat the cafeteria

food if you brought your own, but he's going to buy you lunch.

Actually, the government will. And in some ways you're paying for that too because we're all taxpayers.

After that, you'll hear defense closing argument and then the government rebuttal, and then the case will be in your hands.

But right now we need to finish this witness. So, Mr. Seiden, you may begin cross-examination.

MR. SEIDEN: If the Court please. Thank you very much.

MATTHEW DAOUD, GOVERNMENT WITNESS, PREVIOUSLY SWORN CROSS-EXAMINATION

12 BY MR. SEIDEN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- Q. You are Matthew Daoud?
- 14 | A. Yes, sir.
- Q. You are the same Matthew Daoud that had testified yesterday in this matter?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. And you understand, sir, you're still under oath?
- Q. Okay. I had a little problem hearing yesterday. You have a very soft voice. I'm sure you're very large in life, but you
- 22 have a little voice. So I'm going to ask you a few questions
- you may have been asked yesterday. Tolerate me if you would,
- 24 please.
- 25 | A. Okay.

- 1 Q. You are associated with HSI?
- 2 A. Yes, sir.
- 3 Q. Homeland Security?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. How long have you been with them?
- 6 | A. Over 13 years.
- 7 Q. And I take it that your basic MOS is that you deal largely
- 8 | with the electronics, technology?
- 9 \parallel A. Yes. My team -- my team -- within my team and partially
- 10 for my office, I deal with electronics.
- 11 Q. Okay. Now, I take it that's not your only responsibility.
- 12 A. No. sir.
- 13 Q. You are an armed agent under normal circumstances.
- 14 A. Yes, sir.
- 15 Q. Okay. So you -- you also take -- you're also involved in
- 16 other activities, such as surveillance and interdiction with
- 17 suspects from time to time. Is that correct?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. But you are also -- you seem to be the expert in the
- 20 | technology for your office.
- 21 A. One of many.
- Q. You can -- you can say yes. You don't have to be modest
- 23 about that. Okay.
- Now, you had indicated that you had seized a
- 25 | telephone -- or you received a telephone, I believe you said,

- 1 | from Mr. Gan. Did I misunderstand that?
- 2 A. No, I didn't receive any phones from them.
- 3 Q. You did not.
- 4 A. No.
- 5 | Q. Okay.
- 6 A. I was given phones by the case agent.
- Q. Okay. I'm going to ask you, if it's not too difficult for you, either to pull the microphone closer or get -- I know the
- 9 knees get in the way there, but --
- THE COURT: Yeah. The mic, you can move it toward you.
- 12 THE WITNESS: I apologize.
- 13 BY MR. SEIDEN:
- 14 Q. You didn't do anything wrong to apologize for yet.
- So you received a phone from -- purported to be
- 16 Mr. Gan's phone.
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Okay. And you were told that phone was as a result of his
- arrest, I think you said, in November of 2018. Is that right?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Okay. And then you applied a software. Cellebrite, I
- 22 | think you said it was.
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And you did a Cellebrite report to determine some of
- 25 the contents of the phone. Is that right?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Okay. Now, you also received a phone, I believe, from
- 3 Ms. Lim at some point.
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Okay. And you did a Cellebrite on that phone as well.
- 6 A. Yes.
- Q. When we looked in Ms. Lim's phone, it had the first name
 was a guy by the name of Haiping -- I think it said "Haip Pan."
- 9 Do you remember that?
- 10 A. I don't. I don't recall.
- 11 Q. Okay. But then the 161st name was somebody else. It was
- 12 Mr. Gan's, actually. Do you know why there would be 160 names
- 13 between the two?
- 15 Q. Okay. Is that random, or is that by usage, or is it
- 16 | alphabetical? Do you know?
- 17 A. To answer that question, I'd have to speculate on multiple
- 18 | factors that might have --
- 19 Q. I don't need you to speculate.
- 20 A. So, yeah, I don't -- I don't know.
- 21 Q. Okay. But that is the way the phone worked. Is that
- 22 right? The Cellebrite.
- 23 A. I would have to re-review Ms. Lim's Cellebrite report.
- Q. Okay. Now, you also indicated -- you used the word
- 25 | "encryption." We all hear that word a lot. Can you tell us

Encryption in the simplest terms I can think about is if

1

again, please, what that means.

2

you take a piece of information and you scramble or disguise it

4

and that a code or a pass phrase can descramble it and make it

5

make sense again.

6

Q. So let me see if I understand that.

7

time that the text that I send you -- makes a lot of sense --

So I use my iPhone and I text you. And from the

8

9

to the time it floats down through the air -- when it's

10

floating through the air, it's encrypted. So if Bob could grab

11

some of that information out of the air, it would just be

12

random nonsensical information?

13

A. Roughly speaking, yeah. There are different levels of

14

encryption. Encryption can happen at different phases of the

15

communication. End to end refers to the act of it being

16

transmitted, like you just said, intercepting it in the middle.

17

Things can be encrypted on the device also.

18

Q. So when it travels through the air and ends up on another

19

20

unencrypt, then I can read -- you can read the message I sent

phone that is designed to understand how to unscramble or

21

A. Correct.

you.

23

22

Q. Okay. And encryption isn't just used for our text

24

messages; it's used for codes. Our -- our national coding and,

25

you know, the CIA and all kinds of government agencies use

- 1 | encrypted information. Is that right?
- A. I'm not sure specifically what you're referring to, but encryption is widely used.
 - Q. It's widely used. And it's used so that the sender can send information to the receiver and not have an open -- an open airway, so to speak.
 - A. Yes.

4

5

6

7

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. And I have an iPhone. Other people have the
 Samsung and those phones. Those all use encryption when it
 comes to their text messages. Is that right?
- 11 A. No.
- 12 Q. Who doesn't?
 - A. Each -- each operating -- all these phones use different operating systems. That's the software that makes it work as a phone or be able to do things like have applications or text-message or make calls.

By default, devices on an Android platform created by Google don't typically have their text messages encrypted. You would have to do -- install a third-party application.

- Q. But the OS with the Apple is encrypted, is it not?
- A. It has a form of encryption.
 - Q. Okay. Now, I live in the United States, so it would make sense that I would either have one or the other that we just described, an iPhone or a -- what was the other, a -- what does Samsung use?

- 1 A. They're based on an Android platform.
- 2 Q. On an Android. I would either have an Apple or an Android
- 3 phone most probably here in the States. Is that right?
- 4 A. I would say that's fair to say, yeah.
- 5 Q. But if I lived in another country, I might have the service
- 6 | that's provided in that country.
- 7 A. Again, I'm not sure what you're referring to. But there
- 8 are --
- 9 Q. You're right.
- 10 A. Yeah.
- 11 Q. So I'll ask you a different question. If I come from
- 12 China, it's probable I'm using WeChat. Is that right?
- 13 A. WeChat is an application that can be installed on a phone.
- 14 It's not an operating system.
- 15 Q. Right. It's common in -- it's more common in China than it
- 16 is here. Is that right?
- 17 A. I think that's fair to say. But it's widely used here.
- 18 Q. Okay. And WeChat is also encrypted.
- 19 A. Yes. To my knowledge, yes.
- 20 | Q. All right. And the fact that a message is encrypted
- 21 doesn't necessarily mean that the message is good or bad or --
- 22 there's no connotation to the actual message as a result of the
- 23 encryption. Is that correct?
- 24 A. I don't think there's an implied connotation.
- 25 Q. Thank you.

All right. You had talked about some messages being marked for deletion. All right. And so without being too technical, a phone has a hard drive. Is that right?

- 4 A. That's a good description, yes.
- Q. Okay. And it also has software to teach the hard drive how to work. Is that correct?
- 7 | A. Yes.

1

2

- Q. It's like having a body without a soul. Unless there's
 something in there that gives it instructions how to work, it's
 just a piece of metal. Is that right?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Okay. So there is a limitation -- is there not? -- to the space on a hard drive.
- 14 | A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And -- so I get pictures all the time from my family. And if I just keep downloading those pictures, eventually my hard drive will fill. Is that right?
- 18 A. Yes.
- Q. And then my phone will become useless unless I either get a larger hard drive or I delete some of the pictures. Is that correct?
- 22 A. That's fair to say, yes.
- Q. And that would be the same with text messages or any information that would have to be stored on the hard drive. Is that right?

- 1 A. That's not necessarily true.
- Q. Okay. Some of the information may be stored in what we
- 3 call the cloud. Is that right?
- 4 A. Yes, some applications can be stored in the cloud.
- Q. Can be. Okay. And that would not necessarily be on my
- 6 | hard drive.
- 7 A. It could be in one or both places.
- 8 Q. But if I wanted to keep my hard drive fairly clear, it
- 9 would be imperative that I delete some of the stuff I received,
- 10 stuff being a technical term.
- 11 A. I guess that's a -- a personal choice of the user. I mean,
- 12 there's ways to expand your storage. But if you wanted to keep
- 13 | it clear, you would have to delete things.
- 14 Q. Okay. Now, I'm not talking about expanding the storage;
- 15 I'm talking about utilizing the storage that I have.
- 16 Expanding the storage comes with a cost, does it not?
- 17 A. Yes, cloud storage typically costs.
- 18 Q. Okay. So the fact that something is deleted from a phone
- is not necessarily an indication of something bad. Is that
- 20 right?
- 21 A. Not necessarily.
- 22 Q. Okay. It could be nothing more than the user's desire to
- 23 | keep -- to utilize the storage -- to utilize the storage
- 24 | capacity less. I think I said that badly, but I think you may
- 25 understand what I'm talking about.

1 To maximize the storage capacity.

- A. Certainly that could be their technique.
 - Q. Okay. Now, now that we've resolved that, let's jump ahead a wee bit.

(Counsel conferring.)

MR. SEIDEN: Excuse me one second, your Honor.

(Counsel conferring.)

MS. STEVENS: I've got it.

MR. SEIDEN: Do we have it? Yes. Okay. Do we

have -- page 1. Thank you.

She found it.

12 BY MR. SEIDEN:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q. Do you -- you don't have any of the --

THE COURT: Do you want to use the ELMO?

MR. SEIDEN: I think so, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. And is this an exhibit in

17 | evidence?

MR. SEIDEN: This exhibit is 304-9, government

exhibit, and it is in evidence.

THE COURT: All right.

BY MR. SEIDEN:

- Q. This is 304-9. Did you have occasion to see this yesterday when you were testifying?
- A. Yes, I believe I did see this yesterday.
- 25 Q. And this purports to be a -- a WhatsApp. WhatsApp is an

- 1 application like WeChat or iText or one of the other
- 2 applications we talked about. Is that right?
- MR. SEIDEN: Okay. Turn this on. I was moving away and caught myself.
- 5 (Off-the-record discussion.)
- 6 THE WITNESS: That's the --
- 7 BY MR. SEIDEN:
- 8 Q. That's one of those --
- 9 \parallel A. WhatsApp is an instant messaging application.
- 10 | Q. Pretty much like we were just talking about, right?
- 11 A. Similar.
- 12 Q. Okay. Is that encoded or encrypted?
- 13 A. It can be end-to-end encrypted.
- MR. SEIDEN: Excuse me, folks.
- 15 BY MR. SEIDEN:
- 16 Q. And this apparently is a -- it's dated November 18, 2016.
- 17 | Is that correct?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And it's on WhatsApp.
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. And does this say who this is from?
- 22 A. This says -- yes, it does.
- 23 | Q. And it indicates: "Use this from now on."
- 24 A. Yes.
- $25 \parallel Q$. Do you know what the antecedent of "this" is?

- 1 A. No.
- Q. I'm going to show you page 2, if I might, of that same
- 3 document of the -- of the same -- see if I can do this without
- 4 knocking it over.
- 5 This is dated -- this is page 2 of the same -- of
- 6 304-9, government's exhibit. Do you see this document?
- 7 | A. Yes.
- 8 Q. Dated December 9.
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. What's -- again, it's on WhatsApp.
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 | Q. All right. And I notice that there are -- the Pan message
- 13 | is empty.
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Can you account for why it's empty?
- 16 A. No. I -- it would -- there's a variety of reasons why that
- 17 | might be empty.
- 18 Q. Okay. And then Gan says: "[I] got it."
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 | Q. And the next time you hear from Gan, empty message.
- 21 | A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Can you account for why that message is empty?
- 23 A. No, I can't.
- 24 \parallel Q. Can you determine what was said or communicated in that
- 25 message?

- 1 A. No.
- 2 | Q. I'm going to show you page 3, December 12.

3 Do you see that?

- 4 A. Yes.
- Q. I'm going to try to make it just a little bigger so everybody can see it better. There we go.

7 And that's also WhatsApp?

- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Okay. That's the same platform that we talked about a minute ago?
- 11 A. Yes.
- Q. And you have four -- four communications of some sort from Pan at the very same time.

14 Do you see that?

- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. And then the last message is empty. Is that correct?
- 17 A. Excuse me. There's three at the same time.
- 18 Q. I said -- did I say four?
- 19 A. Yeah. I'm sorry.
- Q. No, glad you corrected me. Listen. This is -- it's what you say that's important, not what I say.

So you've got three messages at the very same time, and then there is one that is hours later. Is that correct?

- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. There's nothing there from Gan.

- 1 A. No.
- Q. And there's no way of determining whether Gan ever received
- these messages or read these messages. Is that right?
- 4 A. I don't know that that's necessarily true. There might be
- 5 | a read receipt, but I would have to dive into it.
- 6 | Q. But looking at this document, it doesn't -- it's not there.
- 7 A. No.
- 8 Q. Okay. And then we'll take a look at page 4 of the same --
- 9 of the same exhibit. And that's dated December 13.
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Again, WhatsApp.
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. Again, we have two communications purported from Pan at the
- 14 same time.
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. And the first one says: "There's only this Bank of China."
- 17 Is that correct?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Okay. And then it has the empty message from Pan.
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Not to be overly redundant, there's no -- you don't know
- 22 why it's an empty message.
- 23 A. I don't have a reason.
- 24 Q. Okay. Thank you.
- 25 I looked at your -- your extraction report. And I see

- 1 | that -- that would be under, by the way, 304.
- 2 Can you give me the date of the last -- of the last 3 information extracted in that report?
- 4 A. I don't have that information off the top of my head. I'm sorry.
 - Q. I know you don't. If I might -- I'm going to take mine out.
- 8 MR. SEIDEN: And if I may step forward, Judge.
- 9 THE COURT: Go ahead.
- 10 BY MR. SEIDEN:
- 11 Q. Okay. I'll give you my copy so we can save a bunch of time.
- 13 A. Okay.

6

- Q. Take a look at -- please tell me, if you can, what the last date of an extraction of that particular phone -- of that report was.
- 17 A. If you're referring me to the extraction end date, that
 18 would --
- 19 | Q. Yes, sir.
- 20 A. -- that would be November 28th, 2018.
- 21 Q. Okay. And what's the first date?
- 22 A. Extraction start date, November 28th, 2018.
- 23 Q. Okay. I'm going to -- I'm going to step forward --
- 24 probably should have asked you this when you had everything in
- 25 | hand -- and I'm going to ask you to look at this document

- again. I'm sorry. I -- actually, it's 304-7, which is I think the last page of that document.
 - I -- I noticed even the extraction report is from November 28, 2018. What's the last date -- I'm going to reach over. What's the last date of the call log on there?
- A. On -- on this page, the last entry, which is a contacts entry, is April 14th, 2017.
- Q. Here are the rest -- is the rest of the document. See if there's anything on there that shows any call log past April of 2017.

And while you're looking, that's Mr. Gan's phone that was seized in November of '18, right?

A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

18

19

21

- 14 Q. Okay. Continue looking, please.
- 15 On these sheets, I don't see another date.
- 16 Now, just to be clear -- thank you. I'm going to Q. Okav. take that back from you. 17

Just to be clear, as far as you are aware, when Mr. Gan was arrested, his phone was taken. Is that correct?

- 20 Α. Yes.
- Okay. And as far as you're aware, he wasn't told in 22 advance that he was being arrested.
- 23 Α. Oh, I don't -- I don't have that information.
- 24 Q. Okay. You wouldn't think that would have been the case, 25 though. Is that right?

- 1 A. Yeah. I'd have no idea.
- 2 Q. Okay. So you get his phone on November -- November of
- 3 2018. But the last entry on the dock -- in his phone, the last
- 4 | call log in his phone, was April 2017. Is that correct?
- 5 A. That's the last entry in the pages provided me. The actual
- 6 extract may have other data.
- 7 | Q. Okay. This is what the government gave you?
- 8 A. Yeah -- yes.
- 9 Q. Okay. Now, we're done with this. I'm going to move to a
- 10 different area, and I'm going to do this a lot quicker. Okay?
- 11 You were also pressed into service for the purposes
- 12 of -- of surveillance. Is that correct?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. And you saw the tapes, and we're -- I'm not going to put
- 15 you through that again. Okay?
- 16 But you had occasion to watch -- was that two
- 17 | transfers or three?
- 19 Q. -- three transfers of money from an individual -- from
- 20 individuals to an undercover agent. Is that correct?
- 21 A. Twice to an undercover agent, and one was a dead drop.
- Q. A dead drop. Oh, right. Put it into a car when nobody was
- 23 there.
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. Okay. Now, one of those was with a guy with a big beard?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 | Q. Turned out to be the son of somebody else?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 | Q. Okay. Now, did you see Mr. Gan in any of those events?
- 5 | A. No, sir.
- 6 MR. SEIDEN: Would you stand up, please, Mr. Gan.
- 7 BY MR. SEIDEN:
- 8 Q. Do you see that man that's standing over there?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 Q. Do you recognize him from any of your observations?
- 11 | A. On that day or --
- 12 Q. On that day.
- 13 A. No.
- 14 Q. Did you see him on any other day?
- 15 A. No.
- 16 MR. SEIDEN: Thank you. Have a seat, please.
- THE COURT: All right. The record will reflect the person standing was the defendant.
- 19 BY MR. SEIDEN:
- Q. On the day that you made those -- that you intercepted those drops, was Mr. Gan present?
- 22 A. To my knowledge, no.
- Q. Okay. On any of the intercepts that you had, did you have
- 24 any information that Mr. Gan had communicated to the people
- 25 making those drops?

- 1 A. I had no information at the time, no.
- 2 | Q. Okay. Did you have information at that time that Ms. Lim
- 3 | had communications with the people making those -- I say
- 4 "drops," but transfers. I don't know what they were. How do
- 5 | you refer to them?
- 6 A. We call them money pickups.
- 7 Q. Okay.
- 8 A. But I understand the terminology "drop." That's fine.
- 9 Q. Okay. I don't live in that world, so -- okay? So thank
 10 you.
- Did you have any communication from Ms. Lim with respect to those money pickups?
- A. I -- my team received information that the defendant was seeking to have these pickups conducted in the Chicago area.
 - Q. I certainly appreciate that answer, but it doesn't answer my question.
- 17 | A. Oh, I'm sorry.

15

- 18 Q. Ms. Lim. I know Ms. Lim was a defendant. So did you
- 19 have -- did you experience any communications with Ms. Lim with
- 20 regard to those pickups?
- 21 A. I did not personally. But that information I think was
- 22 provided via Ms. Lim.
- 23 Q. Okay. So as you came into information from your fellow
- 24 agents, you were told that Ms. Lim had made the arrangements in
- 25 this case with Mr. Gan with regard to those pickups. Is that

- 1 | right?
- 2 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. So Ms. Lim was -- she was intimately involved in the
- 4 pickups as far as you -- the information that came to you.
- 5 A. She had the part in passing that information to us, yes.
- Q. Right. And you were not privy to any conversation she had,
- 7 | if she had any, with Mr. Gan. Is that correct?
- 8 A. No.
- 9 Q. Okay. This is going to sound silly, I suspect, but I'm about done.
- 11 I know you can finger -- strike that.
- 12 Can you fingerprint money?
- 13 A. I'm told yes.
- 14 Q. You haven't done it, though.
- 15 A. I haven't seen an example of it in my career.
- 16 Q. All right. But the money was packaged, that I saw, in plastic. Is that right?
- 18 A. Yes. Some of it was. Sorry.
- Q. Plastic is a medium upon which a fingerprint can be readily recovered. Is that correct?
- 21 A. Typically, yes.
- Q. And not only fingerprints now, but the fingerprint, if a
- 23 person is a secreter -- I think that's the terminology -- you
- 24 can actually pick up their DNA from a fingerprint. Is that
- 25 right?

- 1 A. I don't know about that part of it.
- 2 | Q. Oh, you're not that -- that scientific on that, right?
- 3 A. Not my area.
- 4 Q. Okay. Have you ever heard of that being a case in your --
- 5 | in relation to your work?
- 7 Q. Yes.
- 8 A. I have not heard of that.
- 9 Q. Okay. But the fingerprint certainly can be recovered. Is
- 10 | that right?
- 11 A. From plastic?
- 12 Q. Yes.
- 13 A. I've seen that, yes.
- 14 Q. Do you know whether or not HSI, your group of people,
- extracted any fingerprints from the plastic upon which -- in
- 16 which the money was wrapped?
- 17 A. I don't know. It may have happened.
- 18 Q. Okay.
- MR. SEIDEN: Officer, if you would, remain -- Agent.
- 20 If you would remain seated there for a minute, I'll
- 21 double-check with my team. And I think we're done.
- 22 (Counsel conferring.)
- MR. SEIDEN: Agent, thank you for your time. If
- 24 you'll remain seated there, I think counsel may have some
- 25 questions for you.

1 THE COURT: All right. Any redirect?

MR. ROTHBLATT: Yes, Judge, briefly.

THE COURT: All right.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. ROTHBLATT:

- Q. Good morning, Special Agent Daoud.
- A. Good morning.
- Q. You were asked some questions on cross-examination about encrypted communications. Do you recall those questions?
 - A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

15

16

- 11 Q. And you testified about end-to-end encryption. What is end-to-end encryption?
- A. End-to-end encryption is -- is referring to the communication as it -- as it passes from one party to the next.
 - It -- as opposed to a stationary piece of information at one end or the other being stored on that device. It's a different kind of encryption.
- Q. Based on your training and experience, do you understand that BlackBerry messages are end-to-end encrypted?
- A. I'm not aware of their exact encryption method, but I believe they did have a form of public key encryption.
- 22 Q. What about WhatsApp communications?
- 23 A. WhatsApp is definitely end-to-end encrypted.
- Q. And based on your training and experience, do you understand that law enforcement officials can capture WhatsApp

- 1 communications in real time?
- 2 A. They can't capture them in real time.
- 3 | Q. Why not?
- 4 A. Because of the end-to-end encryption. Any information that would be intercepted would make no sense.
- Q. Do you recall being asked questions on cross-examination about certain communications being marked for deletion?
- 8 A. Yes.
- Q. And I believe you testified yesterday about certain
 communications between defendant's phone and the 5188 number,
 or Pan phone 1, and the 4888 number, Pan phone 2. Do you
 recall that testimony?
- 13 A. Yes.

19

- Q. And what, if anything, about those communications and whether they were marked for deletion did you observe?
- A. I -- what's -- what struck me as interesting is that -that the entries that were deleted were all -- were usually
 only related to those phone numbers.
 - Q. And when you say "marked for deletion," what does that mean?
- A. That would be like saying that a piece of information

 put -- had a label put on it, said that we can reuse this space

 when needed.
- Q. And how does the user come into that process?
- 25 A. If you were going to delete a text message or an instant

- message, that would be a manual process unless you reset the entire device.
- Q. And do you recall being asked questions on cross-examination about Exhibit 304-9, the WhatsApp communications between Pan and the defendant?
- 6 A. Yes.

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. And what, if anything, did you notice about those communications based on your review of the extraction report?
 - A. The empty content?
- 10 Q. Yes, the empty content in particular.

What -- you said that there are several reasons, on cross-examination, why there may be an empty message. Can you tell the jury what some of those reasons might be.

- A. It could be that it was deleted and then the system then reused that disc space. It could be that it was just an empty message sent. That occurs occasionally. These are all ideas that could explain it.
- Q. Again, you were asked questions about the extraction report for the phones seized from the defendant. Do you recall those questions on cross-examination?
- A. Yes.
- Q. I'm going to direct your attention to Government Exhibit 304-1.
- 24 MR. ROTHBLATT: Judge, this has been admitted into evidence.

- 1 THE COURT: All right.
- 2 MR. ROTHBLATT: I'd ask to publish it.
- 3 BY MR. ROTHBLATT:
- 4 Q. Special Agent Daoud, do you see the "MSISDN" entry?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. And do you see the number next to it, "523313192988"? Did
- 7 I read that correctly?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Can you tell the jury. What's an MSISDN?
- 10 A. It's a Mobile Station International Subscriber Directory
- 11 Number, or the phone number.
- 12 Q. And the 52 number in front of the phone number. Based on
- 13 your training and experience, what does the 52 reflect?
- 14 A. A Mexico-based number.
- 15 Q. I want to direct your attention now to Government
- 16 Exhibit 304-7. Do you recall being asked questions about this
- 17 on cross-examination?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. And what is Government Exhibit 304-7?
- 20 A. The communications log.
- 21 Q. And you were asked questions on cross-examination about the
- 22 date range of this particular communications log. Do you
- 23 recall those questions?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 | Q. Were the communications logs admitted into evidence the

- totality of the communications logs captured on the extraction
 report?
- 3 A. No.
- 4 Q. Were there others?
- 5 | A. Yes.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. ROTHBLATT: Your Honor, may I have a moment?

THE COURT: You may.

(Counsel conferring.)

MR. ROTHBLATT: Nothing further, Judge.

THE COURT: Any recross?

MR. SEIDEN: Yes, very briefly.

RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SEIDEN:

- Q. Didn't quite understand something. When you said that there was a message that was not -- that we said had no message -- you have the line? You said that one of the ways you could do that is by deletion. Is that right?
- A. There could be a -- you -- yeah. I mean, theoretically, if you could reset your phone. Let's say you backed up the message and then --
- Q. Yeah, we're not --
- 22 A. Okay.
- Q. -- talking about rebooting a phone. We're talking about I
 got a message, and one part of the message says "[NO MESSAGE]."

 Can I delete a part of a message? Or do I have to delete the

- 1 whole message?
- 2 A. The user can mark a whole message for deletion.
- However, theoretically, the operating system may reclaim that space in part.
 - Q. I got it. But it would -- would it reclaim the same space all the time?
 - A. No. It's -- there's different approaches.
- 8 Q. Okay.

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- MR. SEIDEN: Thank you. I -- Agent, once again, I'm done with this. Thank you again. Have a good day.
 - THE WITNESS: Thank you.
 - THE COURT: Any additional questions?
 - MR. ROTHBLATT: No, Judge.
- But I think we failed to bring in the actual physical phones, Government Exhibits 301 and 303 yesterday. So we would move for those to be admitted into evidence.
 - THE COURT: Any objection?
- MR. SEIDEN: I'm sorry. I -- I was listening to something else.
 - THE COURT: Yeah. Go ahead and state it again.
- MR. ROTHBLATT: Yes, Judge. I think we forgot to physically move Government's Exhibits 301 and 303 into evidence, the phones. So we'd ask to do that now.
- MR. SEIDEN: Can we have a sidebar?
- 25 THE COURT: All right.

1 MR. SEIDEN: Normally I wouldn't care. 2 (At sidebar outside the hearing of the jury.) 3 THE COURT: Go ahead. 4 MR. SEIDEN: All hearsay. So is he going to take the 5 phone out? If he takes the phone out -- I mean, lay a 6 foundation or --I thought these were offered yesterday. 7 THE COURT: 8 COURT REPORTER: Can you move the package off the mic. 9 THE COURT: I thought these were offered yesterday. 10 raised this, and the government thought they had been 11 offered --12 MR. SEIDEN: I don't remember it being offered. 13 I'm just getting old and senile, but --14 MR. FRANZBLAU: I think he -- we think they were 15 offered. It's out of an abundance of caution. I think he 16 offered it for identification, but we weren't certain if it was 17 actually moved into evidence. 18 You've stipulated to all the information on it. 19 MR. SEIDEN: I -- yeah. I'm not going to -- I don't 20 care what the stipulation is. I'm not going to agree that the 21 package -- if you want to put the phones in --22 THE COURT: All right. Do you object --23 MR. SEIDEN: -- knock yourself out. 24 THE COURT: Do you object to them opening these

packages and then putting them in a clear package with an

exhibit sticker on it? 1 2 MR. SEIDEN: I do not. 3 THE COURT: Okay. I don't think that's going to break 4 the chain of custody at this point. 5 MR. SEIDEN: You can ask him. They can ask him if 6 that's his --They did. 7 MS. STEVENS: 8 THE COURT: They did. 9 MR. SEIDEN: Okay. 10 THE COURT: He went through this already. So I'll --11 301 and 303 are admitted in evidence in a separate package. 12 (Government Exhibits 301 and 303 admitted in evidence.) 13 MR. SEIDEN: I'm not going to win the appeal on the 14 chain of custody, so I'll stipulate to that, Judge. 15 THE COURT: There may be no appeal. 16 MR. SEIDEN: Okay. 17 THE COURT: So okay. So that will be -- they're both 18 admitted in evidence. 19 MR. SEIDEN: Okay, Judge. 20 MR. FRANZBLAU: Thank you, your Honor. 21 (In open court in the hearing of the jury.) 22 MR. SEIDEN: Your Honor, with that caveat, then we 23 will have no objection. 24 THE COURT: All right. 301 and 303 admitted, to be 25 packaged in a separate way that identifies them correctly as

1

301 and 303. They're admitted without objection.

2

All right. Any additional questions of this witness?

3

MR. FRANZBLAU: No, your Honor. United States rests.

4

THE COURT: All right. Sir, you're excused.

5

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

THE COURT:

6

THE COURT: And the government rests its case?

7

MR. FRANZBLAU: Yes, your Honor.

8

All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we'll take a brief break. And we'll have you back here -- not for

10

9

closing arguments. But what I would ask you to do is hand a

11

copy of your preliminary instructions to the court security

12

officer. If they're back in the jury room, give them to him

13

back there. But I want to make sure we get 14 copies back.

14

If you have notes on your preliminary jury

15

instructions that you want to transfer to your notepad, do that back in the jury room and then give them to the court security

16

officer. But I'm going to give you new instructions, and I

17 18

want to make sure I get 14 back so we don't have the wrong

19

instructions for you.

20

I think that would make the most sense. Go back there,

So -- in fact, you can do all that back in the jury

21 22

and he'll collect them from you once you're comfortable that

23

you -- you want to give them back and if you have any notes

24

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.

you've transferred them. Thank you.

Rule 29(a) Motion for Judgment of Acquittal (Jury out at 10:15 a.m.) 1 THE COURT: All right. Let's have the defendant --2 3 government's rested. Is the defense going to put on any evidence? 4 5 MR. SEIDEN: We are not. 6 But before I even address, that we have our motion --7 Rule 29 motion, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead. 9 MR. SEIDEN: And, additionally, we are going to 10 additionally argue as to jurisdictional, on the use of money 11 laundering as an extraterritorial jurisdictional tool. 12 THE COURT: All right. And do you have any additional 13 argument on your Rule 29 motion? 14 MR. SEIDEN: Your Honor, I had learned during the 15 course of the case that you are keenly aware of the testimony 16 that has been going in. We -- actually, it's your -- do you want to do it? 17 18 MS. STEVENS: No. Finish. 19 MR. SEIDEN: Okay. We do not perceive that the 20 government has established a burden pursuant -- they have not 21 established a prima facie case, first of all, with Count V --22 going backwards, Count V at all because their witness is 23 particularly -- was particularly clear on that issue with 24 regard to the requirement for licensure in the state of

Illinois, that the transaction occurred in Illinois between --

Rule 29(a) Motion for Judgment of Acquittal and I described the people that it occurred with, and they had indicated they're the ones that would have to be licensed and nobody else. That's -- that's one.

Similarly, transfers -- their -- their witnesses said that there were -- thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. SEIDEN: Their witnesses indicated that Mr. Gan made no transfers in the United States, so that takes care of II to IV.

Now, then there is the conspiracy, and I believe that the government has failed to establish a *prima facie* case with regard to that. I understand that you have heard the evidence in the case. And you know I could argue all day. I don't think it's necessary, your Honor. I think you have your arms around it.

THE COURT: All right. Any response by the government? Briefly.

MR. FRANZBLAU: Yes, your Honor. As to Counts I through IV, there has been substantial evidence that the defendant was knowingly causing -- from Mexico causing these transactions to occur inside Illinois. You have Ms. Lim's testimony, which that testimony alone hits on all of the elements for Counts I through IV. She's substantially corroborated by recordings of the defendant and, of course, the video recordings of what happened next when these transactions

Rule 29(a) Motion for Judgment of Acquittal occurred.

Then you have recordings during the transactions when the defendant is checking in about how it's going and complaining about how it's going and then recorded conversations after when he's confirming that the transaction's been completed. So he is all over these transactions in Chicago, deeply enmeshed. I don't think I need to say more about Counts I through IV.

As to Count V, the IDFPR witness testified that if you are outside of Illinois causing these transactions to happen and you're being paid to do it, you would have to register. You'd have to be licensed if that's what you're doing as a business; if you are doing this on behalf of third parties, you're providing a service in return for payment, that you would have to register.

So that's exactly what's going on in this case. You don't have to be a brick-and-mortar business inside Illinois. If you're outside and causing this stuff to happen inside, as he testified very clearly, you need to register with the state.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. SEIDEN: Your Honor, 1956(f) requires -- it requires presence in the United States. So -- we are arguing it requires presence in the United States. That would be our argument, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Well, Rule 29(b) allows me to

Rule 29(a) Motion for Judgment of Acquittal reserve decision, which is what I'm going to do on this. The 1 2 extraterritorial argument was something made before trial in a 3 motion to dismiss the indictment. I ruled on that in some 4 detail. 5 But I'll reserve decision under Rule -- which I'm 6 allowed to do under Rule 29(b) on this motion. Your --7 obviously, your arguments are preserved based on your motion 8 you've made right now. 9 MR. SEIDEN: Very well. So then --10 THE COURT: Okay. 11 MR. SEIDEN: -- then -- so my record is complete, my 12 29(a) will be reserved to a 29(b). 13 THE COURT: Reserved under Rule 29(b). And I can 14 consider it based on the evidence that exists at this moment 15 when I either grant or deny the motion after there's been a 16 verdict. 17 (Counsel conferring.) 18 MR. SEIDEN: Okay. And on the (b), we're also talking 19 about enlargement. We're also going to be resisting the 20 enlargement of 1956 pursuant to Section (2). So that would be 21 part of our argument then. 22 THE COURT: I don't understand. 23 MR. SEIDEN: In other words, they can't enlarge 24 1956 -- we'll make a more -- a cogent argument when we do this

at the (b), your Honor. But I want to reserve the entire

Rule 29(a) Motion for Judgment of Acquittal thing. 1 THE COURT: Well, the record will show what's 2 3 reserved. 4 MR. SEIDEN: Okay. Very good. 5 THE COURT: I'm not going to comment on what you have 6 or have not reserved. You've made your argument in brief, 7 which is what I asked for, a brief argument. I'm reserving 8 decision. And that's the ruling. 9 MR. SEIDEN: Your Honor, with regard to the defense 10 case --11 THE COURT: Yes. MR. SEIDEN: -- it is our intention to rest. I have 12 13 communicated with my client. And, once again this morning, as 14 late as this morning, my client does not choose -- does not 15 wish to testify. 16 I believe that the Court will want to do something 17 with regard to that. 18 THE COURT: That's correct. 19 And by the way, he was not present for our instruction 20 conference this morning. You waive his presence, correct? 21 MR. SEIDEN: We waived it last night, and we revisited 22 again this morning. We're fine. 23 THE COURT: All right. Very good. 24 Why don't you have your client come up here. And, 25 actually, will he be -- will a translator be able to work with

```
Waiver of Defendant's Right to Testify
      him when he's up here?
 1
               MR. SEIDEN: Sure.
 2
 3
               THE COURT: Okay.
 4
               All right, sir. Please raise your right hand.
 5
          (Defendant duly sworn.)
 6
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
 7
               THE COURT: All right. Sir, you have a right to
 8
      testify if you want to.
 9
               Do you understand that?
10
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
11
               THE COURT: You have a constitutional right not to
12
      testify.
13
               Do you understand that?
14
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
15
               THE COURT: If you decide not to testify, I'll
16
      instruct the jury that no inference or suggestion of guilt can
17
      be drawn from the fact you did not testify.
18
               Do you understand that?
19
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
20
               THE COURT: Has your lawyer explained these rights to
21
      you?
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
22
23
               THE COURT: Have you discussed this -- this issue with
24
      your lawyer?
25
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
```

	Waiver of Defendant's Right to Testify
1	THE COURT: Do you have any questions for me?
2	THE DEFENDANT: No.
3	THE COURT: Do you want to talk to your lawyer
4	privately on this issue any more?
5	THE DEFENDANT: We have discussed already.
6	THE COURT: Do you wish to discuss it any further with
7	your lawyer?
8	THE DEFENDANT: No. We have discussed this morning.
9	THE COURT: All right. Sir, then my question to you
10	is, do you want to testify or not?
11	THE DEFENDANT: I'm not going to testify.
12	THE COURT: All right. I find that the defendant
13	Well, are there any additional questions the
14	government believes I should ask?
15	MR. FRANZBLAU: No, your Honor.
16	THE COURT: Are there any additional questions defense
17	agrees I should ask?
18	MS. STEVENS: No, your Honor.
19	THE COURT: Or believes I should ask.
20	MS. STEVENS: No, your Honor.
21	THE COURT: All right. I find the defendant has
22	knowingly waived his right to testify. And that completes the
23	colloquy.
24	All right. You can have a seat, sir.
25	THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.

```
THE COURT: Yes, sir? Mr. Seiden.
 1
 2
               MR. SEIDEN: You're going to call the jury out, and
      I'll rest?
 3
               THE COURT: Yeah. We'll call them out. You can
 4
 5
      formally rest in front of the jury. I want to take a minute
 6
      and see how far we are away from getting the copies of
 7
      instructions made so I can tell them how long our next break
 8
     will be.
               But I think that should all -- we should do a formal
 9
      resting on the record -- we have to -- in front of them.
10
               All right. So let's take a five-minute break right
11
      now for me to find out where we're at on copying.
12
               MR. FRANZBLAU: Thank you, Judge.
13
               THE COURT: And is the government ready to proceed
14
      after that?
15
               MR. FRANZBLAU: Yes.
16
               MR. ROTHBLATT: Yes.
17
               THE COURT: With closings. All right.
18
               MS. STEVENS: Thank you, your Honor.
19
               THE COURT: So you ought to set up if you have --
20
               MR. ROTHBLATT: Will do, Judge.
21
               THE COURT: -- anything you're going to be using --
22
               Off the record.
23
          (Off-the-record discussion.)
24
          (Recess at 10:25 a.m., until 10:30 a.m.)
25
               THE COURT: All right. Parties ready to proceed?
```

1 MR. FRANZBLAU: Yes, Judge. 2 MR. SEIDEN: We are. 3 THE COURT: All right. We have instructions that we 4 will -- final set. We'll give one to defense, one to the 5 government. 6 MR. SEIDEN: Thank you. THE COURT: A verdict form for each of you. 7 8 I think the interpreters wanted a --9 MS. STEVENS: Your Honor --10 MR. SEIDEN: We need one for the -- thank you. 11 LAW CLERK: It's coming. MR. SEIDEN: And keep that together. 12 13 THE COURT: All right. Then let's bring in the jury. 14 And do you want to give the instructions to Dan. 15 He'll hand them out to them when they come in. 16 Dan, we will put on your chair 14 sets of 17 instructions. You can hand it to them as they come in. Thank 18 you. 19 COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise. 20 (Jury in at 10:36 a.m.) 21 THE COURT: All right. Please be seated, ladies and 22 gentlemen. 23 All right. The government has rested its case. Mr. Seiden? 24 25 MR. SEIDEN: Your Honor, subject to the admission, if

we -- so that we -- subject to the admission of any evidence that we will suggest, at this time the defense will rest.

THE COURT: All right. Any rebuttal case by the government?

MR. FRANZBLAU: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, you've heard all the evidence you're going to hear in this case.

Ms. Krueger, you had mentioned to the court security officer you wanted to make sure there are ways that you can participate fully and hear what's going on in the jury room during deliberations. We're going to make arrangements for that. I'll address that shortly. But rest assured, you'll be able to fully participate and hear what everyone else is saying too. We'll make arrangements for that.

Ladies and gentlemen, you've all received a copy of the final jury instructions. I'm going to read those to you. Many are similar to the ones that I read to you at the beginning of the case; some are different. Each instruction is important. You'll have a copy of these instructions back with you in the jury room. Again, it's not a memory test.

But I'm going to read them to you now. And after that, we'll have the government's closing argument.

Members of the jury, I'll now instruct you on the law that you must follow in deciding this case. Each of you has a copy of these instructions to use in the jury room. You must

follow all of my instructions about the law, even if you disagree with them. This includes the instructions I gave you before the trial, any instructions I gave you during the trial, and the instructions I'm giving now.

As jurors, you have two duties. Your first duty is to decide the facts from the evidence that you saw and heard here in court. This is your job, not my job or anyone else's job.

Your second duty is to take the law as I give it to you, apply it to the facts, and decide if the government has proved the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

You must perform these duties fairly and impartially.

Do not let sympathy, prejudice, fear, or public opinion

influence you. In addition, do not let any person's race,

color, religion, national ancestry, or gender influence you.

You must not take anything I said or did during the trial as indicating what I think of the evidence or what I think your verdict should be.

The charges against the defendant are in a document called an indictment. You will have a copy of the indictment during your deliberations.

The indictment in this case charges that the defendant committed the crimes of conspiracy to commit money laundering, money laundering, and operating an unlicensed money transmitting business under Illinois law. The defendant has pleaded not guilty to the charges.

The indictment is simply the formal way of telling the defendant what crimes he is accused of committing. It is not evidence that the defendant is guilty. It does not even raise a suspicion of guilt.

The defendant is presumed innocent of each and every one of the charges. This presumption continues throughout the case. It is not overcome unless, from all the evidence in the case, you're convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant is guilty as charged.

The government has the burden of proving the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. This burden of proof stays with the government throughout the case.

The defendant is never required to prove his innocence. He is not required to produce any evidence at all.

You must make your decision based only on the evidence you saw and heard in court. Do not consider anything you may have seen or heard outside of court, including anything from the newspaper, television, radio, the Internet, or any other source.

The evidence includes only what the witnesses said when they were testifying under oath, the exhibits that I allowed into evidence, and the stipulations the lawyers agreed to. A stipulation is an agreement that certain facts are true or that a witness would have given certain testimony.

Nothing else is evidence. The lawyers' statements and

arguments are not evidence. If what a lawyer said is different from the evidence as you remember it, the evidence is what counts. The lawyers' questions and objections, likewise, are not evidence.

A lawyer has a duty to object if he thinks a question or evidence is improper. If I sustained objections to questions the lawyers asked, you must not speculate on what the answers might have been. If I struck testimony or an exhibit from the record or told you to disregard something, you must not consider it.

You may have heard the terms "direct evidence" and "circumstantial evidence." Direct evidence is evidence that directly proves a fact. Circumstantial evidence is evidence that indirectly proves a fact.

For example, direct evidence that it was raining outside is testimony by a witness that it was raining.

Circumstantial evidence that it is raining outside is the observation of someone entering a room carrying a wet umbrella.

You are to consider both direct and circumstantial evidence. The law does not say that one is better than the other. It is up to you to decide how much weight to give to any evidence, whether direct or circumstantial.

Give the evidence whatever weight you decide it deserves. Use your common sense in weighing the evidence, and consider the evidence in light of your own everyday experience.

People sometimes look at one fact and conclude from it another fact exists. That's called an inference. You're allowed to make reasonable inferences so long as they're based on the evidence.

Part of your job as jurors is to decide how believable each witness was and how much weight to give each witness's testimony. You may accept all of what a witness said or part of it or none of it.

Some factors you may consider include:

The intelligence of the witness;

The witness's ability and opportunity to see, hear, or know the things the witness testified about;

The witness's demeanor -- I'm sorry.

The witness's memory;

The witness's demeanor;

Whether the witness had any bias, prejudice, or other reason to lie or slant the testimony;

The truthfulness and accuracy of the witness's testimony in light of other evidence presented; and

Inconsistent or consistent statements or conduct by the witness.

Do not make any decision simply by counting the number of witnesses who testified about a certain point. What is important is how truthful and accurate the witnesses were and how much weight you think their testimony deserves.

If you took notes during the trial, you may use them during deliberations to help you remember what happened during the trial. You should use your notes only as aids to your memory. The notes are not evidence. All of you should rely on your independent recollections of the evidence, and you should not be unduly influenced by the notes of other jurors. Notes are not entitled to any more weight than the memory or impressions of each juror.

The defendant has an absolute right not to testify or present evidence. You may not consider it in -- you may not consider in any way the fact that the defendant did not testify or present evidence. You should not even discuss it in your deliberations.

It is proper for an attorney to interview any witness in preparation for trial.

You've heard testimony from witnesses Wei Li and Seok Pheng Lim, who expect a benefit in return for their testimony and cooperation with the government.

You also heard testimony from Seok Pheng Lim -- heard testimony that Seok Pheng Lim has pled guilty to one of the crimes the defendant is charged with committing. You may not consider Lim's guilty plea as evidence against the defendant.

You must give Wei Li and Seok Pheng Lim's testimony whatever weight you believe is appropriate, keeping in mind you must not -- you must consider that testimony with caution and

1

great care.

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

You've heard a witness, namely, HSI Special Agent Jill Dennewitz, who gave opinions and testimony about how drug traffickers and money launderers operate and about her interpretations of certain transcripts. You do not have to accept this witness's opinions or testimony. You should judge this witness's opinions and testimony the same way you judge the testimony of any other witness. In deciding how much weight to give these opinions and testimony, you should consider the witness's qualifications, how she reached her opinions and conclusions, and the factors I've described for determining the believability of testimony.

During the trial, Mandarin and Spanish language recordings, application communications, and text messages were admitted into evidence. You were also given English translations of those recordings, communications, and text messages so you can consider the contents of the recordings, communications, and text messages. You may not rely on any knowledge you may have of the Mandarin and Spanish languages. Rather, your consideration of the transcriptions should be based on the evidence introduced at trial.

Portions of recorded conversations have been deleted as non-pertinent. You should not infer or speculate that important information has been withheld from you either by the government or the defendant.

You've heard recorded conversations and seen video recordings. This is proper evidence you should consider together with and in the same way you consider the other evidence.

You were also given transcripts of the conversations on the recordings to help you follow the recordings as you listened to them. The recordings of the conversations in English are the evidence of what was said and who said it. The transcripts of the conversations in English are not evidence. If you noticed any differences between what you heard in the conversations and what you read in the transcripts, your understanding of the recording is what matters. In other words, you must rely on what you heard, not what you read. And if you could not hear or understand certain parts of the recordings, you must ignore the transcripts as far as those parts are concerned.

I'll be providing you with the recordings of the conversations in English and a laptop computer with instructions on its use. It's up to you to decide whether to listen to the recordings during your deliberations. You may, if you wish, rely on your recollections of what you heard during the trial.

You'll also get copies of the videos that were shown during trial. You can play them on the computer also or choose to rely on your memory of what was in those videos.

Certain charts and graphs were shown to you to help explain other evidence that was admitted. These charts and graphs are not themselves evidence or proof of any facts, so you will not have these particular charts and graph -- graphics during your deliberations.

And when I said earlier "graphs," I meant "graphics."

If you do not correctly reflect -- if they do not correctly reflect the facts shown by the evidence, you should disregard the charts and graphics and determine the facts from the underlying evidence.

You should not speculate why any other person whose name you heard during the trial is not currently on trial before you.

The indictment charges that the crime happened "on or about" certain dates. The government must prove that the crime happened reasonably close to those dates. The government is not required to prove that the crime happened on those exact dates.

The defendant has been accused of more than one crime.

The number of charges is not evidence of guilt and should not influence your decision.

You must consider each charge separately. Your decision on one charge, whether it's guilty or not guilty, should not influence your decision on any other charge.

A person acts knowingly if he realizes what he is

doing and is aware of the nature of his conduct and does not act through ignorance, mistake, or accident. In deciding whether the defendant acted knowingly, you may consider all of the evidence, including what the defendant did or said.

A defendant's presence at the scene of a crime and knowledge that a crime is being committed is not sufficient by itself to establish the defendant's guilt.

If a defendant performed acts that advanced the crime but had no knowledge the crime was being committed or was about to be committed, those acts are not sufficient by themselves to establish the defendant's guilt.

A defendant's association with persons involved in a crime is not sufficient by itself to prove his participation in the crime.

Count I of the indictment charges the defendant with conspiracy. In order for you to find the defendant guilty of this charge, the government must prove both of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

- 1. The conspiracy as charged in Count I existed, namely, that:
 - a. The defendant and others conspired to:
- i. knowingly conduct a financial transaction affecting interstate and foreign commerce;
- ii. which transaction involved the
 proceeds of unlawful activity, namely, buying, selling,

importation, and otherwise dealing in a controlled substance, knowing that the transaction was designed, in whole or in part, to conceal and disguise the nature, location, source, ownership, and control of the proceeds of that unlawful activity; and

iii. that while conducting such financial transaction knew that the property involved in the transaction represented the proceeds of some form of unlawful activity; or

- b. Defendant and others conspired to:
- i. transport, transmit, and transfer a monetary instrument and funds involving the proceeds of unlawful activity, namely, buying, selling, importation, and otherwise dealing in a controlled substance, from a place in the United States to or through a place outside the United States:
- ii. knowing that the monetary instrument and funds involved in the transportation, transmission, and transfer represented the proceeds of some form of unlawful activity; and
- iii. knowing that such transportation, transmission, and transfer was designed, in whole or in part, to conceal and disguise the nature, location, source, ownership, and control of the proceeds.

And:

2. The defendant knowingly became a member of the

conspiracy with an intent to advance the conspiracy.

0.5

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence the government has proved each of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the defendant guilty. If, on the other hand, you find from your consideration of all the evidence that the defendant [sic] has proved -- has failed to prove any one of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should find the defendant not guilty.

And when the -- beginning of that instruction, so it's clear, it's -- the second sentence says, "In order for you to find the defendant guilty of this charge, the government must prove both of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt," it is -- 1. is "The conspiracy as charged in Count I existed," with all the information below it, two separate ways of violating it. And then 2. over on the second page is the second element that has to be proven. 1. has several ways of being proven, and then number 2. has to be proven. And both of those must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt before you can find the defendant guilty. And if the government fails to prove both of those elements beyond a reasonable doubt, you must find the defendant not guilty.

All right. A conspiracy is an express or implied agreement between two or more persons to commit a crime.

Conspiracy may be proven even if its goals were not

1

accomplished.

3

2

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In deciding whether the charged conspiracy existed, you may consider all the circumstances, including the words and acts of each of the alleged participants.

To be a member of a conspiracy, the defendant does not need to join it at the beginning, and he does not need to know all of the other members or all the means by which the illegal goals of the conspiracy were to be accomplished. government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt the defendant was aware of the illegal goals of the conspiracy and knowingly joined the conspiracy.

The defendant is not a member of the conspiracy just because he knew and/or associated with people who were involved in a conspiracy, knew there was a conspiracy, and/or was present during conspiratorial discussions.

In deciding whether the defendant joined the charged conspiracy, you must base your decision only on what the defendant did or said. To determine what the defendant did or said, you may consider the defendant's own words or acts. You may also use the words or acts of other persons to help you decide what the defendant did or said.

A government agent cannot be a co-conspirator.

Evidence has been introduced of recorded conversations and other communications in which one participant was --

(Sotto voce discussion between law clerk and the Court.)

THE COURT: Page 25. Oh, I'm sorry. If I skipped page 24, I'll read it now.

A conspiracy is an express or implied agreement between two or more persons to commit a crime. A conspiracy may be proven even if its goals were not accomplished.

In deciding whether the charged conspiracy existed, you may consider all of the circumstances, including the words and acts of each of the alleged participants.

I believe I read 25.

Let's go off the record for a minute.

(Off-the-record discussion.)

THE COURT: Back on the record.

To be a member of a conspiracy, the defendant does not need to join it at the beginning and does not need to know all the other members or all the means by which the illegal goals of the conspiracy were to be accomplished. The government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant was aware of the illegal goals of the conspiracy and knowingly joined the conspiracy.

The defendant is not a member of a conspiracy just because he knew and/or associated with people who were involved in the conspiracy, knew there was a conspiracy, and/or was present during the conspiratorial discussions.

In deciding whether the defendant joined the charged conspiracy, you must base your decision only on what the

defendant did or said. To determine what the defendant did or said, you may consider the defendant's own words or acts. You may also use the words or acts of other persons to help you decide what the defendant did or said.

All right. On to page 26.

A government agent cannot be a co-conspirator.

Evidence has been introduced of recorded conversations and other communications in which one person was, at the time of the communication, communicating [sic] with the government. You may consider that person's statement in these communications only for a limited purpose. Specifically, you may consider that person's statement only to help you understand what other people in the communications were talking about.

With regard to Seok Pheng Lim, this instruction applies to recorded communications in which she participated beginning May 3rd, 2018, at which time she began cooperating with the government.

MR. FRANZBLAU: Judge, excuse me. I'm sorry to interrupt you. I think that you may have misread one word in the first sentence of the second paragraph.

THE COURT: All right. Then I'll reread -- the first sentence of the second paragraph?

MR. FRANZBLAU: Yeah, beginning with "Evidence has been introduced."

THE COURT: All right. I'll reread it. I apologize.

Evidence has been introduced of recorded conversations and other communications in which one person was, at the time of the communication, cooperating with the government.

All right. And the rest of the instruction has been read to you.

All right. On page 27.

Count I of the indictment charges that the defendant conspired to commit two different offenses as set forth in the indictment. In other words, it's charged that defendant conspired to commit different, separate substantive crimes or offenses.

The government is not required to prove the defendant conspired to commit both of these offenses. However, the government is required to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant conspired with one or more people to commit at least one of these offenses -- one of those offenses.

To find that the government has proven this, you must unanimously agree upon which of the different offenses the defendant conspired to commit. If you cannot agree in that manner, you must find the defendant not guilty.

As it applies to Counts I through IV, the term "proceeds" is defined as any property derived from or obtained or retained, directly or indirectly, through some form of unlawful activity, including the gross receipts of such

1 activity.

It is a felony under federal law for any person, without authorization, to knowingly or intentionally manufacture, distribute, or dispense, or possess with intent to manufacture, distribute, or dispense, a controlled substance.

Heroin, cocaine, crystal methamphetamine, and marijuana are controlled substances.

As it applies to Counts I through IV, the term "financial transaction" means a transfer, delivery, or other disposition involving one or more monetary instruments, which in any way or degree affects interstate commerce or a transfer between accounts, exchange of currency, involving the use of a financial institution which is engaged in or the activities of which affect interstate ... commerce.

The term "monetary instruments" includes currency of the United States.

The term "financial institution" includes, for example, commercial banks.

"Interstate commerce" means trade, transactions, transportation, or communication between any point in a state and any place outside of that state, or between two points within a state through a place outside the state. "Foreign commerce" means trade, transactions, transportation, or communication between a point in one country and a place outside the country -- outside that country, or between two

points within a country through a place outside that country.

When an individual or financial institution in Illinois is engaged in commerce outside of that state, or when an individual or financial institution in Illinois purchases goods or services -- services which come from outside that state, then the activities of that individual and financial institution affect interstate commerce.

The government must prove that it was foreseeable that defendant's acts would affect interstate or foreign commerce.

The government need not prove the defendant knew or intended that his actions would affect interstate or foreign commerce.

The term "conceal or disguise" means to hide the nature, the location, the source, the ownership, or the control of the proceeds of specified unlawful activity.

Counts II, III, and IV of the indictment charge the defendant with money laundering by concealment. In order for you to find the defendant guilty of each of these charges, the government must prove each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt for each count:

- (1) The defendant knowingly conducted or attempted to conduct a financial transaction; and
- (2) Some or all of the property involved in the financial transaction was proceeds of the buying and selling or otherwise dealing in controlled substances; and
 - (3) The defendant knew that the property involved in

the financial transaction represented proceeds of some form of unlawful activity; and

(4) The defendant knew that the transaction was designed, in whole or in part, to conceal or disguise the nature, the location, the source, the ownership, or the control of the proceeds involved.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence the government has proved each of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt as to the charge you're considering, then you should find the defendant guilty of the charge -- of that charge.

If, on the other hand, you find from your consideration of all the evidence that the government has failed to prove any one of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt as to the charge you are considering, then you should find the defendant not guilty of that charge.

As to Counts II through V, any person who knowingly aids, counsels, commands, induces, or procures the commission of an offense may be found guilty of that offense if he knowingly participated in the criminal activity and tried to make it succeed.

If a defendant knowingly causes the acts of another, then that defendant is responsible for those acts as though he personally committed them.

Count V of the indictment charges the defendant with

operating an unlicensed money transmitting business. In order for you to find the defendant guilty of this charge, the government must prove each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt:

- (1) The defendant knowingly conducted, controlled, managed, supervised, directed, or owned all or part of a money transmitting business; and
- (2) Which business affected interstate or foreign commerce in any manner or degree; and
 - (3) Which business was operated in Illinois; and
- (4) Which business was required to be licensed in Illinois:
- (5) Which business was operated without such required license; and
- (6) Illinois law punished the lack of license as a misdemeanor or a felony.

If you find from your consideration of all the evidence that the government has proved each of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt as to the charge you are considering, then you should find the defendant guilty of that charge.

If, on the other hand, you find from your consideration of all the evidence that the government has failed to prove any one of these elements beyond a reasonable doubt as to the charge you are considering, then you should find the defendant not guilty of that charge.

The term "money transmitting" includes transferring funds on behalf of the public by any and all means, including, but not limited to, transfers within this country or to locations abroad by wire, check, draft, facsimile, or courier.

Illinois state law requires a license to do business as a money transmitter. It is a felony to do business as a money transmitter without a license.

Under Illinois law, a "money transmitter" means a person who is located in or doing business in Illinois and who directly or through authorized sellers does any of the following in this state:

- (1) Sells or issues payment instruments;
- (2) Engages in the business of receiving money for transmission or transmitting money; or
- (3) Engages in the business of exchanging, for compensation, money of the United States government or a foreign government to or from money of another government.

"Under Illinois law, 'transmitting money' means the transmission of money by any means, including transmissions to or from locations within the United States or to and from locations outside the United States by payment instrument, facsimile or electronic transfer, or otherwise, and includes bill payment services."

The government has the burden of proving the defendant was not entrapped by government agents and informants. The

2

3 4

5

6 7

8

9 10

12

11

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt either:

- (1) Neither government agents nor government informants induced the defendant to commit the offense; or
- (2) The defendant was predisposed to commit the offense before he had contact with government agents or informants.

I'll now define what I mean by the terms "induce" and "predisposed."

A government agent or informant "induces" a defendant to commit a crime: (1) if the agent or informant solicits the defendant to commit the crime and (2) does something in addition that would influence a person to commit a crime that the person would not commit if left to his own devices. other conduct -- conduct may consist of repeated attempts at persuasion; coercive tactics; pleas based on need, sympathy, or friendship; or any other conduct that creates a risk that a person who would not commit the crime is left -- if left to his own devices will do so in response to the efforts of the agent or informant.

A defendant is "predisposed" to commit the crime -charged crime if, before he was approached by a government agent or informant, he was ready and willing to commit the crime and likely would have committed it without the intervention of an agent or informant, or he wanted to commit the crime but had not yet found the means.

Predisposition requires more than a mere desire, urge, or inclination to engage in the charged crime. Rather, it concerns the likelihood the defendant would have committed the crime if the agent or informant had not approached him.

In deciding whether the government has met its burden of proving that the defendant was predisposed to commit the crime, you may consider the defendant's character or reputation; whether the government initially suggested the criminal activity; whether the defendant engaged in the criminal activity for profit; whether the defendant showed any -- showed a reluctance to commit the crime that was overcome by persuasion by the agent or informant; and the nature of the inducement or persuasion that was used.

These last instructions I'm going to read to you after the closing arguments.

So with that, is the government ready to give its closing argument?

MR. ROTHBLATT: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: You may proceed.

And, Mr. Rothblatt, do you want this hooked into the computer or --

MR. ROTHBLATT: Yes, please, Judge, to the desk here.

THE COURT: It's at the government table or --

MR. ROTHBLATT: Yes.

THE COURT: You have it there. Okay.

~ 4

MR. ROTHBLATT: May I proceed, Judge? 1 2 THE COURT: You may. 3 (Closing arguments of counsel not herein transcribed.) 4 THE COURT: All right, ladies and gentlemen. 5 going to take a brief recess, and then you're going to come 6 I'm going to give you the final instructions, and then back. 7 we'll have you go back and you'll begin to deliberate. But I 8 need to take a short recess before that occurs. 9 So, once again, you haven't received the last of the 10 instructions, so don't discuss the case among yourselves or 11 with anyone else while you're back there. 12 I don't expect this to last more than five or ten 13 minutes, but, once again, my word has been broken many times. 14 But I'm going to try and make it five to ten minutes, and then 15 we'll come out for the final two or three instructions. 16 Thank you. 17 COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise. 18 (Jury out at 2:25 p.m.) 19 (Defendant exits the courtroom.) 20 THE COURT: All right. Please be seated. 21 In looking through the last of the instructions, I 22 don't see in here the *Silvern* instruction, the 7.03. 23 MR. SEIDEN: Why would we need that now? 24 THE COURT: Well, that is given before -- I typically give it before the jury goes out. It requires -- it tells them 25

they need a unanimous verdict. It's a critical instruction.

MR. ROTHBLATT: Yeah, Judge. That should be in there.

MR. FRANZBLAU: That was a major oversight.

THE COURT: And so I've asked my law clerk -- that's the only reason I took a recess, by the way. I've asked my law clerk to print it up.

But, Mr. Seiden, I give this routinely in every civil and criminal case. It's the last instruction typically that's read to a jury. It's reread if they're having some difficulty reaching unanimous verdict.

MR. SEIDEN: When I see that, it's usually a primer or a *Silvern* instruction when they can't reach a verdict.

THE COURT: Well, it's -- actually, the Seventh Circuit recommends giving it now.

MR. SEIDEN: Okay.

THE COURT: And I always do. And it's an oversight by me too that I should have seen this. But I -- what I'm going to do is read that to the jury. We're going to hand -- excuse me -- hand out 12 copies of it to the jury so they have it, just say it's an additional instruction to add to their pack.

And I'll make sure when this is printed up -- because there's language in there about the defense. So let's make sure we have the correct language in there before we give it to the jury.

MR. SEIDEN: Very well.

THE COURT: But it's 7.03. You might want to all look 1 2 And if you -- there's a couple brackets there. 3 there's any particular language you want there. 4 MR. FRANZBLAU: Absolutely. Thank you, Judge. 5 THE COURT: All right. Okay. 6 Off the record. (Off-the-record discussion.) 7 8 THE COURT: All right. Then let's get 7.03 and make 9 sure it's read to the jury. 10 MR. FRANZBLAU: Thank you, Judge. 11 THE COURT: Okay. 12 (Recess at 2:28 p.m., until 2:31 p.m.) 13 THE COURT: All right. In the original pack of 14 instructions, we did not include the 7.0 -- what is it? 7 --15 MS. STEVENS: 3? 16 MR. SEIDEN: 7.03. 17 MS. STEVENS: 7.02? I forget. 18 THE COURT: (Continuing) -- Pattern 7.03, which is 19 also known as a Silvern instruction. 20 We've now included it. I've run the language by both 21 the government and defense. This is word for word what's in 22 the pattern instruction. They've all agreed to that language. 23 And so when the jury comes back -- we'll make multiple 24 copies of this, by the way. We'll give one to each juror. And 25 then when they come back, I'm going to read pages 40 and 41 of

the set of instructions they have. I'll read this last instruction, which I'll tell them should be a supplement to what they have in their packet.

I'm not going to read the verdict form again. They have -- they've seen it. I read it to them at the beginning.

I'll tell them the verdict form is -- will be given, and I'll hand it to the court security officer to give it to him.

I'm going to swear the court reporter/interpreter for Ms. Krueger and give her instructions and so both the jury knows also what Ms. Krueger -- or Ms. Dillon's role -- Ms. Dillon's role is back there.

And then I'm going to -- after that is done, I'll excuse them and ask Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Munier -- I believe that's how it's pronounced -- to remain in the courtroom. They are our alternate jurors. I'll dismiss them, tell them not to discuss the cases in case they need to be recalled if one of our 12 jurors becomes ill or unable to participate in deliberations.

MR. SEIDEN: So I can't give them a watch out there in the hall?

THE COURT: You cannot. You cannot because they are potentially going to become jurors in the case --

MR. SEIDEN: I know.

THE COURT: -- if the others can't.

That's the procedure we're going to follow. Any

```
objection to anything I've just said?
 1
 2
               MR. FRANZBLAU: No, your Honor.
               MS. STEVENS: No, your Honor.
 3
               MR. SEIDEN:
 4
                            No.
               MS. STEVENS: But I do have something to put on the
 5
 6
               I know we spoke off the record about --
      record.
 7
               THE COURT: By the way, you're waiving your client's
 8
      presence for this portion?
 9
               MR. SEIDEN:
                            I am.
10
               MS. STEVENS: Yes.
11
               THE COURT: Okay.
12
               MS. STEVENS: I know we spoke off the record about the
13
      situation with the hard-of-hearing juror.
14
               THE COURT: Yes.
15
               MS. STEVENS: And we had some discussions about making
16
      sure that neither --
17
               THE COURT: Yes.
18
               MS. STEVENS: -- the hard-of-hearing juror nor any
19
      other juror could go back and look at any of the transcripts
20
      from --
21
               THE COURT: Yeah.
22
               MS. STEVENS: -- the trial.
23
               THE COURT: Ms. Dillon has -- is going to reboot the
24
      computer, if I'm saying it correctly, or, if not reboot it,
25
      open a new file --
```

MS. STEVENS: Perfect. 1 THE COURT: -- which means all of the transcriptions 2 3 from the trial itself are not available to either Ms. Krueger 4 or any other juror. They can't look, nor can she, at prior 5 testimony. 6 MS. STEVENS: Perfect. Thank you. THE COURT: Okay. 7 MR. SEIDEN: The 29 will be entered and continued 8 9 until --10 THE COURT: Pardon me? 11 MR. SEIDEN: 29(b) will be entered and continued at 12 this point? 13 THE COURT: That's correct. 14 MR. SEIDEN: Okay. 15 THE COURT: You're renewing it right now? 16 MR. SEIDEN: No. 17 MS. STEVENS: Yeah. 18 MR. SEIDEN: No, no, no. I just want to make sure 19 that we don't forget it. It's --20 THE COURT: Yeah. It's been entered and continued. 21 I'll deal with it --22 MR. SEIDEN: You won't forget it. I want to make sure 23 that it is of record, that it will be after the --24 THE COURT: After the verdict. If necessary, I'll 25 consider it at that time.

Jury Charge (Final Resumed)

All right. We have our --

LAW CLERK: Copies for everybody.

THE COURT: -- copies for everyone. Why don't you put them over for Dan to hand out. And we'll bring in the jury.

And the government has a clean computer?

MR. ROTHBLATT: Yes. Defense checked it as well.

THE COURT: Okay. Very good.

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.

(Jury in at 2:38 p.m.)

THE COURT: All right. Please be seated, ladies and gentlemen.

The court security officer has one additional instruction I want to give you. You should have 14 copies there. If you can hand them out, please.

This is one additional instruction I'll be reading you that was not in the original packet.

All right. Does everyone have a copy? Please raise your hand if you don't have a copy of the instruction I just handed out. We're missing one? All right. Here's an extra one in the front row, so we'll hand it back to you. Thank you.

All right. I'd ask you to turn to page 40 of your instruction packet.

All right. Once you're all in the jury room, the first thing you should do is choose a foreperson. The foreperson should see to it that your discussions are carried

Jury Charge (Final Resumed)

on in an organized way and that everyone has a fair chance to be heard. You may discuss the case only when all jurors are present.

Once you start deliberating, do not communicate about the case or your deliberations with anyone except other members of your jury. You may not communicate with others about the case or your deliberations by any means, including oral or written communication, or any electronic communication, such as by phone, text, instant messenger, or the Internet or any websites.

If you need to communicate with me while you're deliberating, send a note through the court security officer. The note should be signed by the foreperson or by one or more members of the jury. To have a complete record of this trial, it's important you do not communicate with me except by a written note. I may have to talk to the lawyers about your message, so it may take me some time to get back to you. You may continue your deliberations while you wait for my answer.

Please be advised that transcripts of trial testimony are not available to you. You must rely on your collective memory of the testimony.

If you send me a message, do not include the breakdown of any votes you may have conducted. In other words, don't tell me you're split 6-6 or 8-4 or whatever your vote happens to be.

Jury Charge (Final Resumed)

A verdict form has been prepared for you. You will take this form with you to the jury room. When you've reached unanimous agreement, your foreperson will fill in, date, and sign the verdict form. Each of you will sign it.

Advise the court security officer once you've reached a verdict. When you come back to the courtroom, I'll read the verdict aloud.

And, finally, the handout I gave you, I'm going to read that.

The verdict must represent the considered judgment of each juror. Your verdict, whether it is guilty or not guilty, must be unanimous. You should make every reasonable effort to reach a verdict. In doing so, you should consult with each other, express your own views, and listen to your fellow jurors' opinions. Discuss your differences with an open mind. Do not hesitate to reexamine your own view and change your opinion if you come to believe it is wrong. But you should not surrender your honest beliefs about the weight or effect of evidence solely because of the opinions of your fellow jurors or just so there can be a unanimous verdict.

The 12 of you should give fair and equal consideration to all the evidence. You should deliberate with the goal of reaching an agreement that is consistent with the individual judgment of each juror.

You are the impartial judges of the facts. Your sole

٥.

interest is to determine whether the government has proved its case beyond a reasonable doubt.

Please swear the court security officer.

THE CLERK: Can you raise your right hand, please. (Court security officer duly sworn.)

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: I do.

THE COURT: All right. And, Ms. Dillon, please raise your right hand.

I'm going to -- you are going to be allowed to be present during jury deliberations solely for the purpose of aiding communications between Ms. Krueger and the other jurors.

Ms. Dillon is not a juror and therefore cannot offer opinions or recollections concerning testimony, evidence, or trial proceedings, and no one should ask Ms. Dillon for recollections or opinions concerning any aspect of the trial.

Do you promise to follow those directions?

MS. DILLON: I do.

THE COURT: All right. The -- Ms. Krueger's iPad will not have any testimony on it from the trial. And Ms. Dillon, as I've just said, is not to be a participant in your deliberations. She's merely there to assist Ms. Krueger in hearing and transcribing questions and conversations among the jurors themselves. That is her sole purpose to be back in the jury room.

Secondly, you will have a computer in the jury room to

allow you to hear -- and there will be directions, I believe, but at least there will be a computer that should be -- someone of the 12 should know how to work it, and, if not, send a note out and we'll make sure you get directions. That'll have -- where you'll have the ability to play any tapes that were played in court, English-speaking tapes, and any videos that you'd want to -- that -- if you choose to listen to them or watch them.

The transcription binders of the transcripts, you're -- you should take those back to the jury room. You can use those during your deliberations.

All other evidence that was introduced will be brought back to you shortly, and you can use it and review it for your deliberations.

You'll also get a copy of the indictment. That will be given back to you.

Finally, you'll get a verdict form, which I'm going to give to the court security officer. And he can take that and hand it to one of the jurors so that it can be used during deliberations.

Timing. You can leave at 4:30 if it's your choice.

You can -- you can stay until 5:00, but that's about the limit of how late you can stay today if you haven't reached a verdict.

If you haven't, you'll come in tomorrow, continue your

Alternate Jurors Excused

deliberations. I'd like you in by 9:00 unless that creates an impossible problem. And if there is, let the court security officer know, and we'll start a little bit later. But -- and you're free to start earlier if you all collectively agree that starting earlier is something you want to do.

If you are still deliberating, lunch will again be -you'll again go down as a group to the second floor. Court
security officer will buy you lunch. And you can eat lunch in
the jury room, and you can continue to deliberate while you're
eating lunch.

All right. I believe that is all of the instructions I wanted to give you. With that, I'm going to ask you to go back to the jury room. And I'd ask Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Munier to remain in the courtroom.

COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.

(Jury out at 2:46 p.m.)

THE COURT: Please be seated.

Mr. Rodriguez and Mr. Munier, you were the 13th and 14th jurors selected. A criminal jury involves 12 people. We have alternates in case some jurors are -- have to be excused because of illness or other types of problems.

So I'm going to discharge you at this time. You won't be deliberating on this case. But I'm going to ask you not to discuss the case with anyone and keep the same instructions

I've had with you before because if one of the 12 jurors cannot

Alternate Jurors Excused

deliberate and reach a verdict for some reason, illness or some other event, you'll be receiving a call from my courtroom deputy to come back in, and you will join the jury to begin deliberations anew.

If you receive no such call, you're free to call my courtroom deputy, and she'll tell you what the verdict was and how it was reached.

But please don't discuss the case with anyone until you learn that there has been a verdict or you're called back to discuss the case fully with the jury that's already going to be deliberating.

I want to thank you for your service. You paid close attention to the case. It's frustrating, I'm sure, to sit through all this evidence and not have the ability to deliberate. But it is the way criminal cases are run because we -- if we didn't have -- if we just went with 12 jurors and one of them got sick, we'd have to start the case all over again. And so I hope you understand the reason for the need for alternate jurors.

You're free to go back to the jury room to gather your belongings. I'm going to ask you to stop at my courtroom deputy's office on your way out to give her contact information so she can reach you. And, if need be, you can reach out to her about a verdict if one is reached.

And, again, I want to thank you for your service.

Alternate Jurors Excused

And please don't discuss anything other than you've been discharged as an alternate juror when you go back to the others. Thank you.

And you can give your materials to -- give them to the court security officer.

(Alternate jurors exit the courtroom.)

THE COURT: All right. Were the instructions to the -- to Ms. Dillon adequate, or does anyone wish further instructions in front of the jury?

MR. FRANZBLAU: The government's position, they were adequate.

THE COURT: Defense?

MS. STEVENS: Defense position, they were adequate.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else then we need to discuss?

I'm going to stay on the record until I have a -something from the defense that they have reviewed all of the
exhibits going back to the jury room and --

MS. STEVENS: I have reviewed the exhibits that are in the cart going back to the jury room. They are all the exhibits that were put into evidence. I believe Mr. Schwartz reviewed the computer to make sure it wasn't -- I don't know -- connected to the Internet or anything else.

THE COURT: All right. And how about the indictment?

Have you reviewed a copy -- redacted form of the indictment?

1 MR. SEIDEN: Yes. THE COURT: All right. And is that in the cart? 2 3 MR. ROTHBLATT: It is, Judge. 4 MS. STEVENS: It is. 5 MR. FRANZBLAU: Yes. 6 THE COURT: All right. And there's no objection to 7 the redacted form, correct? 8 MS. STEVENS: Glenn? 9 MR. SEIDEN: No, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Anything else then we 11 need to discuss while we're on the record? 12 MR. FRANZBLAU: Nothing from the government. 13 THE COURT: Well, I will ask this. When a verdict 14 comes in, whether it's today, tomorrow, Friday, whatever it is, 15 I typically go back after the verdict has been -- I always poll 16 a jury. They'll be polled. You don't have to ask for it. Ι 17 will --18 MR. SEIDEN: We don't have to ask? Okay. 19 THE COURT: I typically go back and thank the jurors 20 for their service. And then if the lawyers agree on the record 21 they won't be -- use anything they learn in discussions with 22 the jury to impeach the verdict, I allow lawyers to go back 23 after I'm done talking to them to speak to the jury. 24 MR. SEIDEN: Impeachment?

THE COURT: Yeah. Yeah. If you waive it on the

25

record, I'll let -- and you don't have to make that decision now. We can wait till the verdict comes in. But lawyers often find it helpful to talk to jurors after to see whatever the jurors want to talk about.

They don't have to talk about deliberations. They can talk about evidence. They can talk about style. They can talk about whatever they want, or they can choose not to. But I give the jurors the option, and many lawyers find it to be a useful exercise to learn, you know, what jurors think about the case and their performance.

Think about it. And if one party doesn't want to agree to it, they don't have to go back. I'll let either party that agrees go back if they want to. If neither side wants to go back, then you won't.

But this one -- I allow attorneys that opportunity because when I was a lawyer, I wish I could have talked to jurors after a verdict. So I figured I get to do that now. So give it some thought.

But I'm going to ask the parties at the time of the verdict -- right after the verdict what their position is, and you can think about that.

I don't allow parties to go back. I don't allow the case agent. I don't allow the defendant. It's too personal. So I let lawyers only go back.

Okay. Anything else we need to put on the record?

1	MR. FRANZBLAU: Nothing from the government.
2	MR. SEIDEN: Nothing, your Honor.
3	THE COURT: Okay. Off the record.
4	(Off-the-record discussion.)
5	(Concluded at 2:51 p.m.)
6	CERTIFICATE
7	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the
8	record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
9	
10	/s/ LAURA R. RENKE May 22, 2020
11	LAURA R. RENKE, CSR, RDR, CRR Official Court Reporter
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	l l